

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Hadjidemetriou, Michael (1995) Attitudes to the police and policing in contemporary Cyprus with particular reference to the dark figure of crime. PhD thesis, Middlesex University. [Thesis]

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6881/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

**ATTITUDES TO THE POLICE AND POLICING IN
CONTEMPORARY CYPRUS WITH PARTICULAR
REFERENCE TO THE DARK FIGURE OF CRIME**

MICHAEL HADJIDEMETRIOU

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.**

MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY

MARCH 1995

**In memory of
Nicholas Hadjidemetriou**

I Michael Hadjidemetriou declare that this study "Attitudes to the Police and Policing in Contemporary Cyprus, with Particular Reference to the Dark Figure of Crime". is the result of personal effort and it has not been duplicated in any way or extracted from works of other authors.

Michael Hadjidemetriou.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | I |
| ABSTRACT | II |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES | 1 |
| SCOPE AND AIM | 10 |
| OBJECTIVES | 13 |
| THE CYPRIOT SETTING | 14 |
| THE POLICE AND THE PUBLIC IN CYPRUS | 34 |
| METHODOLOGY | 48 |
| SURVEY PROCEDURE | 58 |
| DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS | 71 |

PART ONE COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS OF POLICING

CHAPTER ONE

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. ATTITUDES TO THE POLICE AND POLICING METHODS | |
| 1.1 SUMMARY | 80 |
| 1.2 SOCIAL BOND WITH THE POLICE | 80 |
| 1.3 FREQUENCY OF POLICE'S PRESENCE WITHIN NEIGHBOURHOODS | 85 |
| Police's presence in the neighbourhood | 85 |
| Satisfaction of police work in the neighbourhoods | 87 |
| 1.4 FREQUENCY OF PUBLIC CONTACT AND REASONS FOR THE ASSOCIATION WITH THE POLICE | 88 |
| Frequency of public contact and association with the police | 88 |
| Reasons of contact and association with the police | 91 |
| Level of satisfaction as a result of contact and association with the police | 93 |
| 1.5 DISCUSSION | 95 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER ONE | 102 |

CHAPTER TWO

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2. POLICE PERFORMANCE | |
| 2.1 SUMMARY | 117 |
| 2.2 SCALING POLICE PERFORMANCE | 117 |
| 2.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE OF POLICE WORK | 119 |
| 2.4 RESPONSE OF THE POLICE TO AN EMERGENCY SITUATION | 120 |
| 2.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE POLICE IMAGE | 122 |
| Perception of the police by the public as far as equal treatment is concerned | 122 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Ways in which the police mistreats the public | 123 |
| Scope for improvement | 123 |
| Areas in which the police should spend more time | 124 |
| Reasons why the police is not able to fulfil their task | 125 |
| 2.6 DISCUSSION | 126 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER TWO | 132 |
| CHAPTER THREE | |
| 3. IMAGES OF THE POLICE | 144 |
| 3.1 SUMMARY | 144 |
| 3.2 POLICING POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND LABOUR DEMONSTRATIONS | 144 |
| Level of satisfaction from the personal perspective | 144 |
| Level of satisfaction out of awareness | 147 |
| 3.3 POLICING OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR POLITICAL POLARISATION | 148 |
| Different policing method | 148 |
| Events in which the policing method is different | 151 |
| The reasons why the policing method is different | 151 |
| 3.4 CREDIBILITY OF POLICING METHODS | 152 |
| Policing social, political and economic groups | 152 |
| Groups of people who receive different treatment from the police | 154 |
| Ways in which treatment by the police is different towards certain groups of people | 155 |
| 3.5 DISCUSSION | 155 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER THREE | 162 |

PART TWO

VICTIMIZATION AND REPORTING OF CRIME

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAPTER FOUR | |
| 4. AMOUNT OF VICTIMIZATION | 174 |
| 4.1 SUMMARY | 174 |
| 4.2 CASES OF VICTIMIZATION REPORTED ACCORDING TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS | 174 |
| 4.3 FORMS OF VICTIMIZATION REPORTED ACCORDING TO CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS | 179 |
| 4.4 VICTIMIZATION CONSIDERED AS CRIME AND REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES | 180 |
| 4.5 REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING VICTIMIZATION TO THE POLICE | 182 |
| 4.6 DISCUSSION | 185 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER FOUR | 204 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| CHAPTER FIVE | |
| 5. UNREPORTED CRIME | 217 |
| 5.1 SUMMARY | 217 |
| 5.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF DARK FIGURE OF CRIME | 217 |
| Victimization occurring within the year before | 217 |
| Witnessed victimization occurring within the year before | 218 |
| Reporting relatives victimization cases occurring within the year before | 220 |
| Relatives victimization cases occurring within an unspecified period | 220 |
| 5.3 REPORTING VICTIMIZATION CASES | 221 |
| Reasons for not reporting household offences | 221 |
| Reasons for not reporting personal offences | 225 |
| Reasons for not reporting other notifiable offences | 228 |
| 5.4 REPORTING CRIME BY WITNESSES | 229 |
| Reasons for not reporting household offences | 229 |
| Reasons for not reporting personal offences | 230 |
| Reasons for not reporting other notifiable offences | 231 |
| 5.5 REPORTING RELATIVES' VICTIMIZATION CASES | 231 |
| Reasons for not reporting household offences | 231 |
| Reasons for not reporting personal offences | 232 |
| Reasons for not reporting offences within an unspecified period | 232 |
| 5.6 AMOUNT OF VICTIMIZATION CONSIDERED AS CRIMINAL AND REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES | 233 |
| 5.7 DISCUSSION | 234 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER FIVE | 249 |

PART THREE

THE CYPRIOT PROFILE OF VICTIMIZATION

| | |
|---|------------|
| CHAPTER SIX | |
| 6. TOTAL AMOUNT AND PATTERNS OF CRIME IN CYPRUS | 266 |
| 6.1 SUMMARY | 266 |
| 6.2 AMOUNT OF CRIME EXISTING IN CYPRUS | 267 |
| Total amount of household offences | 267 |
| Total amount of personal offences | 272 |
| 6.3 AMOUNT OF CRIME REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES | 274 |
| Amount of household offences reported to the authorities | 274 |
| Amount of personal offences reported to the authorities | 277 |
| 6.4 REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME TO THE AUTHORITIES | 278 |
| 6.5 DISCUSSION | 280 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER SIX | 288 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAPTER SEVEN | |
| 7. CYPRIOT PATTERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CRIMINALITY | 291 |
| 7.1 SUMMARY | 291 |
| 7.2 PERCEIVING THE AMOUNT OF CRIME BY THE PUBLIC | 291 |
| Evaluation of Criminality in Cyprus | 291 |
| Perceiving fluctuation of crime | 292 |
| Assumed reasons for the fluctuation of crime | 296 |
| Forms of crime which fluctuate | 300 |
| 7.3 PERCEIVED REMEDIES TO THE CRIME ISSUE | 319 |
| 7.4 DISCUSSION | 322 |
| TABLES OF CHAPTER SEVEN | 338 |
| CONCLUSION | 349 |
| APPENDICES | |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 366 |
| QUESTIONNAIRES | |
| A. Greek Version | 397 |
| B. English Version | 405 |
| Detailed analysis of responses per question | 415 |
| Forms of victimization per starting point | 429 |
| Number of victimization cases reported per starting point | 450 |
| Detailed figures of dark crime per starting point | 471 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to Professor Geoff Dench and Professor Tony Vass of Middlesex University for their assistance and inspiration as well as their endless patience they have shown to me in the course of this study. I will also like to express my appreciation to Mr. Peter Kontolemis for the suggestions he had made when computing the results as well as the statistical analysis. In addition, many thanks to Mrs Athenoulla Uloupi and Miss Effi Panayi for typing the script. Finally, I wish to extend my gratitude towards Mr Andreas Drakos for editing this work.

Finally, I like to express my love to Katina, Nicholas, George and Kyprianos for the support and understanding they have shown to me while working to complete this study.

ABSTRACT

Cyprus suffered 'anomie' on a grand scale more than twenty years ago, on account of the Turkish invasion of 1974. The effects on the social structure of Cypriot society were devastating. Most of the collective conscience which was responsible for the social order was disrupted. Inevitably, the traditional means of social control which depended primarily on informal social networks and the creation of a collective order were replaced by formal policing.

This thesis attempts to offer an empirical account of the above social changes and the resultant changes in the modes of policing; and how Cypriot-society has replaced the lost collective conscience with alternative but complementary means of social control.

High police density, strong social associations and the strength of kinship have contributed to the acceptance of the police and policing methods. Simultaneously, the public, through the social development of new social norms and moral codes, have determined the form and role of the police in Cypriot society.

The partial destruction of the existing social contract and the inevitable development of anomie have introduced new parameters in deviancy and the process of social control in Cyprus. The new cultural and socioeconomic characteristics of Cyprus reflect the patterns and distribution of criminality.

By and large, Cypriots do not report crimes and victimization to the authorities because they view cases as not just 'trivial' but also as something which could implicate them socially and personally. That is to say, despite the upheaval and social change which followed the 1974 invasion, there is still a very strong norm (which binds people together) about respect and self-esteem. By reporting, they fear that they will be stigmatized for life. They will 'cover-up' crimes rather than expose themselves as victims. In essence, 'triviality' acts as a defence mechanism which neutralizes police involvement in affairs relating to the issue of social order. Police rejection is mostly observed when victimization refers to crimes against the person. Society tolerates certain forms of criminality for the sake of conformity to certain social norms and moral codes. As a consequence, the dark figure of crime is much higher for offences against the person. Because society sanctions tolerance towards certain forms of crime, victims are prevented from reporting because they consider the police as part of the control apparatus which contributes to the perpetuation of stigmatization.

The Cypriot's perception of the amount and patterns of criminality is distorted on account of the influence of the media and rumour. Fear of crime evolves from the wrong perception of criminality rather than experience. Because fear is unjustifiable, the public feels insecure and redefines the structure of the social contract. In effect, this threatens further the collective conscience and the traditional methods of social control.

INTRODUCTION

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

The issue of crime, law and order in contemporary Cyprus offers a unique opportunity to the criminologist to investigate the result of a sudden rupture in the model of social contract and continuity of the social structure. The study also involves the ways in which society of Cyprus, like the Phoenix, restructures itself in order to compensate losses and maintain social order.

Although the Cypriot society is currently at a stage of transformation, certain sociological features are dominant characteristics which are transmitted from generation to generation. Structurally, the Cypriot society projects and reinforces conformity in its moral code which is manifested in a series of social norms which derive from or have evolved in religion, cultural and ethnic characteristics, or general social interaction (Clifford 1954a, 1954b, 1958; Attalides 1981; Hadjidemetriou 1983; Konis 1984, 1990; Loizos 1970, 1972, 1975; Markides 1974; Markides et al 1978; Mouzelis and Attalides 1971; Papadopoulos 1965; Peristianis 1965, 1968; Philippou 1930; Surridge 1930; Taylor 1970). This conformity forms the consensus in the society which assists in the prevention of wrong doing or harm, "collective conscience" (Durkheim 1964a).

Such societies not only generate a defence mechanism in order to prohibit wrong doing but also have a unique mechanism in defining what is wrong and what is right. Behaviour which is accepted and behaviour which is rejected. In addition, such societies maintain a certain amount of tolerance to antisocial behaviour.

The Cypriot setting bears similarities with Dutch tolerance. It is true to say that Dutch tolerance is not a simple blanket acceptance of all manner of behaviour and opinion. It is rooted in a society marked by kindly authoritarianism, deference to one's elders and those in

position of authority with particular respect for the moral dogmas of christianity (Downes 1982). In fact it seems more plausible to suggest that the Dutch crime rate has reflected, obliquely and distortedly, the consequences of myriad social and economic changes which have overall both weakened social control and sharpened economic aspirations (Bagley 1973).

Micro-sociology and specifically symbolic interactionism portrays crime as something which is constructed in small sole interactions in particular context. In addition, emphasis is given to the social meaning and definitions of individuals and upon the ways in which these are expressed in interactions between law-enforcement agents and those who subsequently are labelled as criminals. Individuals are viewed as being actively involved in constructing their own social world. Social constructions are seen as the outcome of the way in which individuals define and give meaning to events, contexts, and situations, and groups of individuals subsequently act on the basis of such meanings and definitions (Becker 1963, 1974; Lemert 1967). Symbolic interactionism has developed from Durkheim's "collective conscience" but differ on the emphasis of consensus in the society.

Initially Cesare Beccaria formulated the principles of consensus in society as to the desirability of protecting private property and personal welfare. These were based on social contract theories of Hobbes, Montesquien and Rousseais. Contemporary sociologists such as Durkheim or Comte have explained adequately the formation of moral contract through religion or kinship.

According to Durkheim, this conception of social solidarity (conformity) always and everywhere necessitates the existence of a strongly formed consensus universal or unity of moral belief. The implication of weakening such a view is that the weakening of this consensus brings about a decline in social cohesion. As

a result, this gives ground for anomie, individualism, and inevitably deviancy and crime. Merton (1954) as a materialist will argue that a manipulation of that "status quo" or social contract will lead to disorganisation and anomie because existing channels or social networks will manifest conflict of interest in the opportunities for wealth. Durkheim's "collective conscience" influenced the work of Merton (1938). Merton's (1968) strain theory saw deviancy as arising from the discrepancy between aspirations which were culturally induced and could not be realistically achieved by legitimate means.

The case of Cyprus satisfies both theoretical approaches. However, criticism to the above approach suggests that the theory of "collective conscience" is defective in explaining social order because it is applicable in a society where property is distributed equally. Radzinowicz (1966) considers ambiguity in social class, Gouldner (1971), and Hollander (1969) gave the individual a past and a future but this is not enough in explaining crime because still it assumed a model of human behaviour held to by agencies of social control. However, as it will be shown later on in the thesis, a strong moral code, less social class segregation, plus obedience to authority, offer the Cypriot society ground for the application of the social contract model.

Warning and opposition to the application of "collective conscience" comes from Giddes (1971b) who suggests:

"In traditional society men are subject to the tyranny of the group; individuality is subordinated to the pressure of the conscience collective".
(Giddens 1971b p. 494).

Results from this thesis will show that indeed certain sectors of the society are stigmatised or terrorised, or indeed their sense of liberty is

questioned simply because the cohesiveness of the society forces margins in their behaviour through a number of social norms.

In Greek society, particularly in the Greek Cypriot community, much of the social control is done by a combination of informal social control in the form of a strong moral conscience which leads to a) conscience collective (Durkheim), and b) symbolism, i.e. via state and church represented in their moral and legal commands and in a symbolic sense, by the uniformed police. The informal moral codes which generate cohesiveness are the following:

| | | | |
|----|--------------|---|-------------|
| a. | Amartia | - | Sin |
| b. | Ntropi | - | Shame |
| c. | Stigmatismos | - | Stigma |
| d. | Ataxia | - | Wrong doing |
| e. | Timi | - | Honour |
| f. | Kalo-Kako | - | Good-Evil |
| g. | Sevasmos | - | Respect |

The above shared values and beliefs form mechanical solidarity which is the basis of social control and social contract. These moral codes, instilled in the individual's moral conscience via a strong closely knit and extended family, act as a social force guiding and regulating interactions. However, these strong moral codes which organised Greek Cypriot Society around common cultural goals have withered away since 1974. In 1974 (Turkish invasion) the community was confronted by a social disaster which was more than just a physical catastrophe. The "conscience collective" suffered a rupture and existing beliefs, ties, interactions, moral messages and codes of contact could not any longer act as sufficient regulators of social control.

The magnitude of the social change can be realised with reference to the fact that one third of the Greek

population was uprooted and became refugees in the South (Konis 1984, 1990). The social conflicts which emerged between Greek refugees and host communities because of distinctive differences in social characteristics such as moral codes and language etc have exerted real social pressures on organised customary and traditional patterns of behaviour (Attalides 1981).

In effect, if there has been a gradual loss of the power of informal social control to contain relationships due to the abrupt social change, a new form of adaptation might have evolved on a grand scale still based on social conformity. This move from informal to more formal means of social control could have exerted pressure towards conformity. Organic solidarity would have been the natural development. Groups and subgroups each one with its own identity interacted with each other and simultaneously achieving common goals. At this stage, order could have been based on the development of systems of law, specifically on restitutive law rather than repressive law (Durkheim 1964a).

However, this social change has brought with it a new social order. It is here that one then sees the importance of the police in emerging as a symbol of the new social order in post 1974 Cyprus. The new social organization has transformed social order from informal social control to one becoming more and more dependent on formal procedures, legal powers, and sanctions. Hence the reason why, since 1974 there has been a serious upsurge in the crime rate (recorded crime). The formal social control apparatus of the state has proliferated and has adopted a more prominent role for itself in the regulation of social relationships. The ascribed role can be explained on the basis that social cohesion or "collective conscience" is weak in administering social control due to the fact that the social rupture has damaged the informal law and order, agencies and institutions.

Similarly, the interactionists, as well as the Chicago school of subculture theorists, give a similar version of explaining the disorganisation of society. The sudden disruption of the organisation in the Cypriot society brought a degree of disorganisation on account that various strands in the society were significantly altered. In a sense, relationships fell into a state of disequilibrium. Generally speaking, relationships within the normal community are perceived as being co-operative: co-operative in the sense that by interaction, the organism (society) helps to establish a state of equilibrium in which conflict is minimal. Currently, relationships are competitive in that each organism struggles against each other for resources. Deviancy occurs when the competition becomes so harsh as to upset the biotic balance (Shaw and Mc Cay 1929). The Chicagoans go a step further on:

" Under the pressure of disintegrative forces, which are endemic in the process the community ceases to function effectively as an agency of social control and as resistance to criminal behaviour diminishes, it becomes not only tolerated but sometimes accepted", (Morris 1957 p.78)

Morris (1957) expands the issue of disorganisation and restructure of society through Symbiosis. Symbiosis is defined as the habitual living together of organisms of different species within the same habitat. Symbiosis occurs at all levels of the community because, as in biology, there is a secession of conformity to the given norms or to the understanding as to what is deviant. In the case of Cyprus, the new inhabitants? who have evolved are mainly the police and their policing role and, on the other hand, the criminals and their deviant behaviour.

Once the normal organisation of the society was

disrupted, organised bodies had to step in and face the issue of social control with formal policing. By doing so they have damaged the natural social order defence mechanism of the society, specifically the continuity of cohesiveness and direction of moral codes and social norms. Because values and beliefs are challenged, the issue of the definition of deviancy has not been unquestioned.

Mead, Becker (1963, 1967, 1971) and Lemert (1966) argue that deviancy manifests itself according to the definition given by the society. For an act to be regarded as deviant, a deviant label has to be confirmed upon it by the society. As in the case of Cyprus, the assumed social disorganisation has produced also conflict in the definition because of the integration of the communities. The dominant culture enforces its definitions and codes of contact on the other.

Results from this study show that the society (sample) finds it difficult to define as to what is criminal and what is not. Also there is a variation as to what constitutes serious crime (references to the variables of age and displaced persons). The above are based on the results of this victimisation survey and endorse what has already been said.

In reality, bonding in the Cypriot society has not stopped to exist, nor values, beliefs, or moral codes have been totally displaced. However, new social order depends up to an extent on formal policing for social control. Considering the magnitude of the bonding in the society, cohesiveness still has a role to play as far as prevention and deterrence of deviancy are concerned. Somehow, the remains of social contract influence conformity and in its turn the function of formal policing. State agents such as the policemen are seen as an integral part of the network of kinship in the society. It follows that the police (in general) are acceptable to the society as administrators of formal law

and order. Because of this cohesive value, the society rates positively the work of the police. In essence, policing is by consent. Alderson (1971) has called policing by consent as community policing.

Because of the rupture in the continuity of kinship, moral code and social contract, certain stratas in the society i.e. the young population, migrant urban population, as well as displaced population, feel hostile to this new setting of social order. This generates conflict and as a result these stratas do not participate in the collectiveness of social contract in crime prevention.

New arrivals on the island (either as refugees or as tourists) add a new social twist to the culture as well as to the social structure and "collective conscience" make it difficult for Symbiosis (Morris 1957). Furthermore, this leads to a further deterioration in social relationships, which produce higher crime rates (recorded) and more significantly new forms of crime altogether.

It is uncertain how long the society will resist a total breakdown of social cohesiveness which will lead to the destruction of the social contract i.e. of law and order as it is traditionally known. If this happens, then the residents would withdraw into individualistic rather than collective solutions to the problem (Dubow and Podolefsky 1982). This assumption can be found in the 'broken windows' hypothesis (Wilson and Kelling 1982) which suggests that as opportunities fall into decline, informal social control weakens and further decline follows.

Equally, it is not certain if there is going to be an increase in the social bonding which will strengthen values, beliefs, and social contract, and inevitably shape law and order towards traditional methods.

The social parameters which are currently observable in Cyprus nowadays relate to a) the fluctuation of the

numbers of foreigners (tourists and refugees with different sets of beliefs and values), b) the breakdown of social norms, and on the other hand, c) attempts by the Christian Orthodox Church to revive religiousness and Greek nationalism. The above parameters are contradictory and conflicting, but there is no reason why these should not cohabit in a habitat (society) as different structures. (Note Symbiosis by Morris 1957).

SCOPE AND AIM

This study intends to investigate the issue of social order and how it is regulated in a society such as the one in Cyprus, which has recently suffered a social rupture in the system of social contract.

Although the "collective conscience" (Durkheim) as well as the social structure, as it is traditionally known, suffered a rupture almost twenty years ago, a new moral construct has evolved which takes into consideration a dualistic approach as far as social control is concerned. The police or formal agencies co-exist with informal means of social control. There is conflict in this approach but it is regulated by a number of defence mechanisms which are based on social interaction and traditional cultural norms, which define the relationship between the public and the police.

Because of the social rupture and the disorganisation of the society, social control has become relaxed and as a consequence recorded deviance and criminality have increased. In a theoretical perspective this can be explained as a conflict in the moral code (Durkheim), a conflict of interest in opportunities (Merton), a contradiction in the definition of deviancy (Becker), or reallocation and distribution of criminal subcultures. All these approaches supplement each other trying to explain the social phenomenon of deviance.

It is not the intention of this study to test any of the above theories through empirical research or recording of "social facts" (Durkheim), but rather to explain the causes, patterns, and magnitude of deviance in the contemporary Cypriot society.

This study will attempt to describe "collective conscience" in Cyprus, how it is formed and the mechanics involved in regulating law and order.

In order to achieve the above scope, it is necessary to record with the aid of empirical research the attitude of the public towards formal policing. This will

establish the acceptance level of policing by formal means, the level of co-operation as well as satisfaction from policing performance. If indeed the public accepts the formal agents of police, then it is assumed that the police are supported by the public and they are considered as a member of the social contract consensus, which aims at crime prevention and crime deterrence.

To supplement the above information it is necessary to record the extent and patterns of criminality in the society. For this reason it is necessary to employ a positivistic method of research in order to record "Social facts" which will support the arguments of social disorganisation.

Using a victimisation method of research, will record victimisation, and in effect generate data of criminality in the Cypriot society. These recordings will define the extent of deviance and criminality in the country. By doing so it is expected to gain knowledge on the patterns of crime in contemporary Cyprus. The way the public perceives crime will provide information on the level of unrecorded crime i.e. dark figures of crime and, as a consequence, the level of crime tolerance in the society. If crime tolerance is evident, then a multitude of reasons can explain this phenomenon. One of them suggests for the existence of a strong "collective conscience" which suppresses reporting for the sake of peace. In order to specify the causes of tolerance it is necessary to study the reasons the public does not report victimization to the police.

Furthermore, this study will show that in a disorganised society a number of institutions, agencies, as well as social structures magnify the issue of deviancy (for specific reasons) which in effect reinforces negative perception of crime evaluation. Bodies such as the media and systems of mass communication amplify the issue of deviancy. In effect moral panic evolves and consequently this influences

social cohesion and social contract. In essence the society is facing a constant bombardment of stressful information which affects the foundations of conformity and security.

It is unclear whether the society will turn back to traditional methods of social order or whether the system will develop a more formal approach to policing. The Cypriot society is currently a hostage to political revelations. Unless there is stability in the political arena, it is uncertain which way the Cypriot society will turn.

In order to investigate the patterns of criminality and inevitably the effect on law and order with reference to the social rupture of 1974 in Cyprus, it is necessary to carry out a methodological study of the parameters relating to the sociological make-up of the Cypriots, the way the society copes with crime issues, the amount of crime, as well as the role of the police as formal agents of crime detection and prevention.

OBJECTIVES

It is necessary to set a number of objectives which will answer the set proposition.

These objectives are:

1. Define "collective conscience" in Cyprus, how it is formed and how it functions as far as deterring, preventing and defining crime.
2. Present the effects and changes of crime patterns which are associated with the social rupture.
3. Present the mechanisms of formal and informal policing before and after the social rupture.
4. Define the degree of integration of the police in the society, and the part they play in the social contract.
5. Calculate the amount and current patterns of crime in Cyprus and how it is manifested.
6. Specify the degree of public awareness of the true level of crime in Cyprus.
7. Define the consequence of fear of crime and moral panic affecting the social contract and generally "collective conscience".
8. Investigate the defence mechanisms which the society activates in order to neutralize fear and moral panic.

THE CYPRIOT SETTING

Political Perspectives

Cyprus is a fairly young Republic (1960) with reference to its formation as an independent country. Cyprus is an island in the Eastern Mediterranean. It gained its independence from the U.K. in 1960 and ever since it is a member of the Commonwealth and the Non-Alligned Movement. It has a population of 650,000 and an estimated police force of 3,600 men including the Fire Brigade. The standard of living is very high compared to that of neighbouring countries. It is developing very fast and has the makings of any other European country. The country has applied for membership to the E.U. It is industrializing very fast and developing very quickly. As a consequence there is a high rate of urbanization, which is due to the fact that industries are located within city limits. Education levels are very high in comparison with other European countries. The police has had their share of development and are not short of technology or police professionalism.

To sum up, the setting is comparable to that of Europe, i.e. industrialization, urbanization, class segregation and a growing sense of anomie, which is the result of the displacement of population during the 1974 Turkish invasion.

>

Economical Perspectives

After Independence, the per capita income had a steady growth, but in 1974 the Turkish invasion brought this steady growth to a halt. After some years of having to combat unemployment and reallocation of foreign investments in the country, Cyprus managed to "come back on her feet" and to bring the standard of living again at high levels together with a parallel increase in the per capita income. Because the wealth is distributed at a greater spectrum of

the population, the conflict between rich and poor is limited. This alone is a factor which deters opportunistic Criminality (Merton 1938), such as Fraud (Sutherland 1961). Furthermore, it deters armed robberies, Ekpenyong (1989) concludes that armed robberies are the result of an overt emphasis on the accumulation of material wealth by any means, and the inability of the system to provide subsistence to many.

After the Turkish invasion, a large number of Cypriots were geographically displaced and reallocated in the southern part of the island. New housing estates were built in order to accommodate the new arrivals in the area. In addition, a large number of people moved from the northern part of Cyprus to the cities in search of refuge and employment. This whole process which took place in 1974 changed the demographic picture of towns and cities in Cyprus (Attalides 1981).

Social Perspectives

Konis (1984), in his capacity as the Director of the Welfare Service in Cyprus, presented a report concerning the social problems of the post-war period between 1974 and 1984. This report shows in detail the extent of the disintegration of the Cypriot society due to the effects of the war and how the society in general fought against these adverse conditions.

"Two in every five families were left homeless and without any income. One in every twenty residents of the country has a close relative killed or gone missing. More than a third of all communities (the foundation of social life) have been destroyed. Half of the remaining communities saw an alarming increase of the population to levels where social functioning became a problem." (Konis 1984 p.11)

The main problems or results of the above conditions were the following:

- a. "Anomie in Urban centres. Some villages were turned to cities within a day.
- b. Degeneration of morals and traditional values.
- c. Old values have been displaced by new ones brought by the reallocated population and refugees.
- e. Social decay, apathy, depression".
(Konis 1984 p.33).

Peristianis (1954), in "Honour and Shame in a Cypriot highland village", has shown that in Cyprus families are described in terms of hierarchy as patrimony and matrimony depending which parent is the financial controller. This varies from area to area and from village to village. This indicates that not only the absence of the father figure will bring disintegration of the family but also the absence of the mother figure.

One in every 150 married Cypriot women has a husband who died or gone missing. One in every 100 has a child gone missing. Considering sisters, mothers, wives together, one in every 20 women has had a husband, brother or child dead or gone missing (Konis 1984).

"The numbers compose an unprecedented in magnitude social problem - a tragedy in a small society like Cyprus". (Konis 1984 p.41)

Another crucial factor that has aided the disintegration or the breaking up of the social chains is the fact that old people considered as the heads of their families, the law enforcers, and supporters of tradition found themselves helpless and stressful. Statistics show that there have been increases in the number of deaths of old people because of natural causes. Notwithstanding the stress, old people faded away leaving a vacuum in social

control and continuity of tradition and social contract. Prior to 1974, there were 400 old people institutionalized in old people's homes. Today there are over 1000. Children not affording the expenditure of supporting their old-age parents or grandparents decided to institutionalize them even though these people are receiving a sufficient pension.

The new generations of Cyprus are not hostile to the old social structure because there are signs of family clustering as well as village comradeship, even among the refugees. In recent years a number of associations have evolved from displaced people. It seems there is a continuous interaction among displaced covillagers i.e. entertainment functions, sports events etc.

The initial blow on the organization of the social structure in Cyprus has passed and now is a period in which the new generations construct foundations for a new social structure based on the blueprints of the old. The church and tradition assist the above development.

Traditional Bases of Social Control in Cyprus

As far as the crime issue is concerned, social control in the past, (prior to the formation of the Republic) insisted that the police should keep a low profile concerning itself, mainly in solving major criminal cases which were damaging to individual people and had disturbing effects on society in general. Family members presented a deterrent factor for any wrong doing, through "collective conscience" (Durkheim 1964a). The peers in society as well as family elders, through their social powers and roles in society, could detect as well as prevent any wrong doing. At the same time this group of people acting together or independently could punish and rehabilitate offenders. See Skogan and Maxfield (1981) and Bennet (1989) as to who participates in community crime

prevention and who is not, within the context of "collective conscience". The above statement is with reference to minor offences only. The general thinking which still exists in Cypriot society states that, if the police are called, then this will bring a kind of stigmatization, as described by Niger Walker (1980), to the persons involved as well as to their families. If the criminal is known, there is no place to hide or be immuned from the isolation from the rest of the villagers. Isolation is a harsh punishment within the village circles. People's behaviour in Cyprus is still governed by a network of nouns such as¹:

- | | | |
|----|--------------|----------------|
| a) | AMARTIA | - Sin |
| b) | NTROPI | - Shame |
| c) | STIGMATISMOS | - Stigma |
| d) | ATAXIA | - Wrongdoing |
| e) | TIMI | - Honour |
| f) | KALO | - What's right |
| g) | SEVASMOS | - Respect |

Amartia

"AMARTIA" relates to the religious aspects of the behaviour of Cypriots. The Greek Cypriots belong to the Christian Orthodox Church which is still influential in their lives. The church has remained conservative and unaffected by social developments. Anyone who acts wrongly in the eyes of the church is an "AMARTOLOS" - sinful and his action "AMARTIA" - sin. This denotes the strong relationship between the church and the people of Cyprus. Therefore, it is true to say that wrong-doing in the

¹. This schema of informal social control in Cyprus was supplied by A.A. Vass who developed a ladder of such controls before and after 1974.

Cypriot society is strongly deterred by the church and the norms laid by the clergy. It is true to assume:

"On the individual level there generally appears to be a modest relation between religiosity and delinquent behaviour. High levels of religiosity are related to relatively low delinquency rates, while lower religiosity is associated with relatively high delinquency rates" (Junger and Polder 1993 p. 430).

In addition, Stark et al (1982) argues that only in moral communities can a relation between religiosity and delinquency be expected. Several authors have described the religiosity of an individual as an aspect of his or her integration within a society or social group (Durkheim 1930; Stark et al 1982; Elison et al 1983; Bainbridge 1989). There are several ways in which religion may influence delinquent behaviour:

1. Religions usually share many values with society as a whole. Therefore, religious people may have a relatively strong bond with those that condemn criminal behaviour. For example, religious persons might more readily feel shame when considering the possibility of committing a crime (Braithwaiste 1989).
2. A religion can hold out a prospect of supernatural reward or punishment (Stark and Bainbridge 1985).
3. Religious institutions create social networks. These networks provide for rewarding social relations that may be threatened by delinquent behaviour (Junger and Polder 1993).

But how does one measure the influence of the church on people? Long ago, the priests were the only educated wealthy people because of the riches of the churches thus having some influence on their flock. The church was and still is the richest institution on the island. Again, this gives some leverage on the lives of the Cypriots. It

is no accident that all Cypriot leaders, before and after independence, are clergymen. Note the late president Makarios the first president of the Republic. He was an Archbishop. Isolation from the church indicates a form of punishment which indeed deters others from committing any wrong deeds. What needs pointing out here is that the clergy's jurisdiction does not stop at the church's matters only. They are the policemen and judges of society.

Ntropi

"NTROPI" is a feeling of shame particularly when a shameful act is involved (this includes deviant behaviour). The Cypriots are proud people and in essence they do not wish their names to be associated with any wrongdoing. As on Shame as Deterrence (Braithwaite 1993, 1989; Elias 1982, 1978) esteem in the Cypriot society is very important particularly when the males have to live up to an image of manhood so much evident in society. Cypriots are over-conscious about themselves and their position in society, to the point of egoism.

Up to a certain extent, the "NTROPI" syndrome also manifests itself in vendettas and revenges. The mechanics dictate that the victim will feel "NTROPI" for a certain form of victimisation as in the case of rape or physical abuse. This is particularly the case because the status of the victims is under question. It is expected that the victim will ask for compensation or indemnities see Icli, (1994) Blood feud in Turkey. This is why during the 1930's and 1940's Cyprus had an average of 40 homicides per year, a significantly high figure (Clifford, 1954).

In essence "NTROPI" has a dual significance, (a) it deters crime and (b) it generates crime once instigated.

Stigmatismos

"STIGMATISMOS" denotes isolation of the person from

the rest of the community. Such action is considered by the Cypriots as a form of excommunication. Due to the fact that Cypriots live in small communities or villages, a person's association with his fellow villagers is important to the person's self-actualization and survival. If a person is excommunicated, he or she is ostracized. As a stigmatised person, he or she is outcast from the community. Nobody will offer this person any support, and this will definitely have an effect on his or her way of life.

Currently in Cyprus certain villages bear the collective stigmatisation for their criminality in the past. Although a criminal act may have been committed many decades ago, the villages still carry the weight of stigmatisation: for example, the villages of the district of Paphos and certain vine villages of the district of Limasol. The stigmatisation and isolation does not stop at a specific spot or location. It spreads on a whole area or district. This with references to the Hassambulia era, the Midas cases at the turn of the century as well as the horrifying murders at Droussia village in 1972. The Hassambulia were a gang which dominated with their presence certain villages of Limassol and Paphos. Actually their actions initiated vendettas and criminality which spread to the vine villages. It is true to say that the above gang leaders indulged in criminal careers; which is defined as the longitudinal sequence of offences committed by an individual offender (Farrington 1992).

Clifford (1954b) summarises the whole aspect of stigmatisation:

"Throughout the years, crimes of honour and those connected with family vendettas have been a feature of Cyprus life. There is some improvement today, but up to recent time there have been the so-called "criminal" villages not

only deep in personal feuds and the concomitant violence but also places where assassins could be hired. These murders were almost always connected with family disputes and dishonour by seduction. In such villages the inhabitants do not go out alone at night and they take elaborate precautions against attack through open doors or windows" (Clifford 1954b p. 149).

The above setting is not novel. Nor are the, patterns of social behaviour specific to the Cypriot culture. Icli (1994) identifies several causes of blood feud in Turkey which also include matters of honour and abduction.

"If he refuses to take revenge, he loses his prestige in the village. He will be placed under great pressure and he will be isolated by losing his friends. He can gain respect only by murdering a man from the other side probably the one whose death will cause the most suffering in the family of the enemy" (Icli 1994 p. 69).

Blood feud is functional in such societies because it strengthens family ties and increases solidarity between the family members (Donmeze 1984). The religious culture of the South is implicated in legitimizing these types of violence (Ellison 1991). Blood feud is seen in many small, politically independent communities when there is no fixed authority (Thumwald 1968). An industrialized society will solve the feud as a retaliation means (Nirum 1975). High density of firearms contributes to carrying out feuds (Lenter 1991).

Ataxia

"ATAXIA" denotes any wrong doing in the society. A person who conducts "ATAXIA" is an "ATAKTOS". "ATAXIA" and "ATAKTOS" are labels usually placed on children's misbehaviour. This shows that the shaping of behaviour

starts from an early age. For this reason society has clear definitions as to what is normal conduct and what is not.

Timi

"TIMI" in Greek means honour and is rightly the opposite of "NTROPI". An honourable person in Cyprus is called "TIMIOS" and every "TIMIOS" has a special place in the society. It is a status most Cypriots will try to gain. "TIMIOS" is a label usually reserved for respectable people i.e. priest, religious people, and generally those who do not cheat or offend others. Usually fellow villagers ask the advice of such people or wish to be part of their company or friendship. A person who is "TIMIOS" has a high social status. It is a label recognised by the church and the society in general.

Parents advise and bless their children to be honourable. The mothers warn their daughters to guard their "TIMI" meaning virginity and good manners.

"TIMI" is a social label not found extensively in Westernized societies because it is a value long lost due to the degeneration of the moral code, individualisation and anomie. One has to travel to the East or Africa, or to the close communities or the minorities living in large European cities, i.e Greek, Turkish, Spanish, Arab, Indian, Pakistani etc.

A person without "TIMI" is an "ATIMOS" (person without honour) an outcast, an Outsider (Becker 1963,1974) who is pinpointed by the rest of the society. This label is reserved for people who misbehave or break social norms. An "ATIMOS" is a stigmatised person who nobody wishes to be associated with. The label encircles and reflects on other members of the family and kinship.

In addition, "TIMI" could be the cause of vengeance and bloodshed in Cyprus (Clifford 1954a). This is not unique or defined to a specific geographic location.

Similar observations are found in neighbouring Turkey which is a different culture altogether (Icli 1994; Donmeze 1984). An eye for an eye (Ellison 1991), Blood Feud (Nirum 1975; Thurnwald 1968).

Kalo

Moral codes not only prevent misbehaviour but also appraise good conduct. A good act is labelled as "KALI" and the person who acts likewise as "KALOS" (kind). The opposite is "KAKO", an evil act and the person who does bad things as "KAKOS", an evil person. Usually people are divided into "KALOS" or "KAKOS". "KALOS" enjoys respect while "KAKOS" is stigmatised and isolated. Parents set "KALO PARADIGMA", good example. The society expects, peers, policemen, and people with status, to set good examples with their behaviour.

A person who is "KALOS" gives the opportunity to his kinship and family to be proud of him.

Sevasmos

Another sign of status is that of "SEVASMOS" meaning respect. "SEVASMOS" is a status usually reserved for the old, for priests, teachers, policemen, the highly educated or the powerful. When a Cypriot respects somebody, it means that he listens, obeys, and does not question nor harm, that person. As a consequence, policemen have a positive response from the public which makes their job much easier.

In order to be granted the status of "SEVASMOS" somebody must be "KALOS" and "TIMIOS". A criminal cannot be "KALOS" or "TIMIOS". Therefore, he has no respect and no position in the society. Because of the importance of one's position in the society it is necessary to maintain "SEVASMO".

Finally it has to be said that these social norms and

labels are transmitted or are affecting the whole clan or family and are even passed from generation to generation. This is one more reason for the families and clans to guard their respectability.

Policing Policy in Cyprus

Aldersons' (1979) main finding is that preventive policing or as some may call it community policing is one method of policing which reflects consent in policing. As a result of this method of policing (i.e. implication of the general public and Institutions in policing), it is possible to control criminality. However, the multi-agency approach should not be uncritically considered as offering a panacea for the plight of inner cities. Multi-agency initiatives can, and do fail, and unfortunate consequences often occur because initiatives are based on oversimplified assumptions. Because of structural conflict between the state agencies, tensions with localities and differential stage agency power relations, the forms of co-operation and outcomes of multi-agency initiatives are often the result of a complicated set of social relations and interactions which are neither consistent nor directly observable (Sampson et al 1988). Alderson's claim is supported by the fact that recorded crime in Devon and Cornwall dropped by 40% in total and 14% among juveniles at a time when recorded crime was on the increase in other parts of the U.K. In essence Alderson (1979) developed one policing policy which seems to produce results but the mechanisms are not quite understood.

In this study I will attempt to a certain extent to elaborate on some of these mechanisms: for instance, personal attitude of the public against the police and against police behaviour, as well as social tolerance to crime with reference to the Cypriot context of policing.

Cyprus, due to her historical and political

development, adopted various forms of policing methods suitable for the occasional political polarization. I have identified several of these forms by the descriptions given by Alderson (1979).

According to Alderson (1979) informal policing is:

"Among the most successful checks on crime in a society are those stemming from traditional and informal social controls. Superstition, taboos, religious customs, shared values and moral standards in one way or another have preceded the laws up on which the more formal policing arrangements of an advanced society are developed. Where a society retains the cohesion and stability of family units it is likely that the behavior of the members of that unit will be controlled and that each and every other family unit will be likewise editing up to a cohesive and stable society" (Alderson 1979 p. 35).

Some forty years ago W.Clifford in his capacity as the Head of Social Welfare Department of the Cyprus Government gave almost the same principles of policing in the country.

".. It should be noted that we are dealing in the main with small integrated communities within which crime has a social context of greater importance than is the case in the large communities in Europe. To find a comparable setting for crime we have to look rather to the scattered rural communities of mountainous Wales than to the impersonal millions of London or Birmingham. From the angle of delinquency and reformation this has two notable effects. It first of all provides a powerful social deterrent to criminal behavior since a person committing an offence has to face his little world of neighbors whose disapproval is more powerful than any penal system..... In Cyprus the insularity and integration of the communities do not offer much scope to the travelling criminal who is quickly recognized as a stranger" (Clifford 1954b p.147).

Thomas (1973) emphasized the management of social control in an English village in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

"They kept an eye on each other's visitors, and were quick to spot any suspicion of scandal" (Thomas 1974 p.629).

Even today the above social involvement forms the basis of social control in Cyprus. Everything relates to the influence of the family unit on its members. One has to be aware of the Cypriot culture and history in order to understand family clustering. I believe this informal control order has a historical background.

"The emphasis that has been laid in the various studies of delinquency upon the value of strong family life might well be reinforced by the picture in Cyprus where family is certainly one of the strongest features of the social structure" (Clifford 1954b p 150).

Informal social control is not a unique feature of Cyprus. Pearson (1990) compares criminal statistics in Israel between Jews and Arabs. He states:

"Moreover, a traditional system of informal dispute resolution (sulha) which operates within Arab communities further obscures comparisons of the official statistical trends between Jews and Arabs" (Pearson 1990 p.240).

However, current social developments and reallocation of population due to the 1974 Turkish invasion on the island, broke up to a certain extent the "collective conscience" the chains of kinship and influence of the unit family on its members.

In terms of crime reporting, modern Cypriots prefer to

be selective when reporting criminality and wrong-doings. This on account that the family headman is displaced and his position is taken over by the policeman or extensively the family policeman who's influence is sometimes questionable. Current research will show that three quarters of all Cypriots have a relative or a friend who is a policeman. In addition, police density in Cyprus is around 150 residents per police officer while in England and Wales the respective figure is 420:1 (Hadjidemetriou 1983). This indicates somehow that the policeman has a direct influence on his family unit in one way or another.

In the past the headman of the family as rightly presented by research, extended his authority to all members of the unit giving justice where it was due and also subduing unwanted behaviour such as criminality. This control was limited to the proximity of family members and not further, unless there was a reason. By doing so family affairs were not externalised, in fear of stigmatization. It inevitably follows that law enforcing agencies were not consulted or informed of any wrong doing. As a result, this has led to a low profile and a low crime reporting rate.

As I have already said, the policeman has substituted the headman as the unit law enforcer and up to some extent his current position manifests contradiction and uncertainty. He has to place his loyalty between his family and his profession. He hesitates as to whether to report to his superiors wrong doings confided to him by his family unit or discard authority and limit knowledge of events only to family members.

Criminal statistics over the recent years show that crime reported has been on the increase. Although there is no evidence to suggest that there is a genuine increase of crime (no longitudinal studies on dark figures of crime) I can suggest that either the policemen do not use

discretionary powers in solving crime issues within the society, or, indeed, there is a genuine increase of crime, or there is a tendency to report victimization, which means that tolerance to crime is lower than what it has been considered. If, indeed, the policeman does not use discretion, it means that personally he reports and motivates victims to come forward to report wrong-doings, irrespective of his position in the family unit. Furthermore, this study will show what kind of people are likely to approach the policeman, and report victimization and for what offence (Chapters four and five).

Surely, there are cases where police officers stay clustered to family unity and disregard law and order, but since there is no evidence or literature on the matter I cannot speculate objectively on the issue. However, I am suggesting that there was a time when general policing in Cyprus was mainly a family affair and the person directly responsible for the application of law and order was the headman. However, with the formation of the Republic and consecutive reallocations of population in 1963 and 1974, the social chains of association and influence have broken: i.e social rupture. With the formation of the independent state, more Greek Cypriots joined the police force. The Greek Cypriot population felt more confident and secure with this situation.

But why did the Cypriots offer such a status to the policeman? I have to go back a few centuries and describe various methods of policing enforced on them by the various administrators.

For many centuries the Cypriots were occupied by Turkey which enforced strict laws on the inhabitants of the island in order to pressurize and subdue. All law enforcing agents were Muslim Turks. It was inevitable that the Christian Greek population clustered into small communities for their own security and welfare. The

enforcing agents were seen with resentment on account that they represented the dominating power.

The same perception of the police was applied years later to the British administration. The British introduced new systems and allowed self governing, and as a consequence a large number of Greek-Cypriots were enlisted in the police force. Still these officers were viewed with resentment and suspicion and were not trusted because they represented an alien regime to them. One way that British rule was imposed or legitimised in the colonies was through the imposition of occupational standards derived from the British National context (Johnson 1982).

Jeffries (1952) documented one problem of the early rules of the colonial territories. Faced with the quandary of ruling by coercion and consent they achieved, a compromise in a system of law that incorporated some local practices while legitimizing others. The police forces were of the people but insulated from them and not governed by them. The continuing dilemma was to persuade the indigenous population that it was not sufficiently advanced to sustain its own judicial practices and law enforcement procedures until it had absorbed the colonial legal construction. Several authors have acknowledged the critical links between the origins of the English police system and the development of colonial institutions. Bayley (1969) recounted the influence of the British police system in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. In the colonial policing literature, there is ample evidence of imperial arrogance (Brogden 1987).

Things became intolerable as far as policing was concerned because during the 1950s the British were forced to apply a punitive form of policing in order to combat E.O.K.A. (liberation movement) activities. A state of emergency was declared and for a number of years the Cypriots had to be policed punitively by the colonials

because they endorsed the terrorist acts of E.O.K.A. The Cypriots found themselves in a similar position as Northern Ireland nowadays. The I.R.A. takes the role of the law enforcing agent in areas where the police seems ineffective. The police having extensive powers to search, arrest and detain in order to find terrorists, had in fact, alienated themselves from the public. These moves became suppressive and intolerable by the Cypriots. The E.O.K.A. movement exerted its authority on law enforcing merely to claim its representation of the Cypriots. The Cypriots have never had it so bad as far as policing was concerned.

Theoretically Alderson (1979) summarizes about such systems:

"Punitive policing has been described as policing by suspended terror". It works on the assumption that provided the penalties for crimes are sufficiently horrible, people will be deterred from committing them. It presupposes firstly that sufficient people will be caught to render it plausible and that sufficient potential offenders will anticipate that they too might be caught" (Alderson 1979 p. 37).

It was not until the 1980s when political stability was achieved and the economy started gaining ground that the police force in Cyprus started thinking about applying a specific policing method.

The police authorities had a number of advantages in their hands aiding them in the formation of policing policy:

a) The role of the policeman carried high status and respect in society.

b) High association and clustering with family members, aided in maintaining the concept of the family unit.

c) The police authorities had inherited a healthy police structure based on discipline and order.

d) Unemployment was low, the economy very stable and class differences almost non-existent.

e) Police perception was positive. The people willing to co-operate on account that the police were viewed as part of the society and specifically part of the family.

f) Crime was relatively low.

From the beginning, police chiefs considered the implication of the police force in social structure and function as crucial. Up to a certain extent this policy was a success, considering the current high crime detection rate, which is above 50%.

Although Alderson (1979) talks about policing by consent he has never really given much emphasis on the mood or attitude of the people prior to the application of what he has called "Preventive Policing". The Cypriots on the other hand have started to initiate their form of community policing from a different perspective.

The ground was fertile enough to accept police initiatives and changes as far as policing issues were concerned. On the other hand in England and Wales the "Preventive Policing" method is debatable because although it asks to involve the general public in policing matters it shows signs of reluctance on account of suspicion both by the public and the police authorities.

In theory, Alderson (1979) has the right ingredients to formulate a community orientated method of policing, for instance, the implication of institutions, groups of people as well as individuals in combating criminality. In this study I will actually study the perceptiveness or the degree of the association of the public with the police and in addition criminal tolerance.

Generally speaking, I intend to take Alderson's "preventive policing" method and extend it by implicating the human factor, social contract as portrayed in "collective conscience", also the positive perception of

the public towards the police, and in a way associate it with low criminality with special references to dark figures of crime, and the degree of tolerance to crime.

In order to define the Cypriot setting, patterns of criminality as well as policing methods and attitudes to the police, it is necessary to make a comparison with other similar situations. I intend to infer from research on the same issues from England and Wales namely: the British Crime Surveys, the Islington Crime Surveys and others. The great advantage of cross-national comparative studies of crime, is to advance our knowledge of the cause of crime and its prevention which has long been acknowledged (Robertson and Taylor 1973). Few systematic comparisons of crime in different countries have so far been completed (Beirne 1983), Violent crime in Scotland and Sweden (McClintock and Wilstrom 1990), Scottish and German experience and perception of their respective criminal justice systems (Dobash et al 1990).

THE POLICE AND THE PUBLIC IN CYPRUS

Historical Development

When Britain acquired Cyprus in 1878, the then police force consisted of 275 Turkish officers, NCO and men. The Turkish policemen were known as "Zabt Etmek". Their main role was to collect taxes from the Greek Cypriots. When Britain assumed control of Cyprus, colonel H. Brackebury R.A. became the first British officer to direct the force. By the end of 1878 the then "Cyprus Military Police" numbered 627 officers and men. The colonial police forces were conscripted as an arm of the military (Foran 1962). In the same year major A.H.A. GORDON formed the "Cyprus Pioneer Corps" numbering 400 men. Not long afterwards the two forces were combined to form one body. The chief of the new force was A.H.A. GORDON who was promoted to colonel. The new force consisted of 8 British officers, 9 Cypriot officers, 220 cavalrymen and 473 on foot. The name "Military Police" did not apply anymore. It was merely a constabulary. The weapons of the men were rifles, bayonets and swords. It must be pointed out that the academic level of the constables was very low. The only qualification required to enlist in the force was the presentation of good character and physical fitness. The academic level, however, increased within the ranks because it is documented that a small detachment of one officer and 30 men went to Crete to train the then newly-formed Cretan police.

Colonial policing has placed its mark on future developments of police organization. It has also effected traditional methods of policing. Although more liberal in comparison to Turkish domination, it did not offer opportunities to the Cypriots to develop cultural and social order defence mechanisms. In the colonial policing literature there is ample evidence of imperial arrogance in relation to indigenous law and legal practices, as they

imposed British criteria. In the Sind, Sir Charles Napier denied any legitimacy to native institutions (Jeffries 1952). In Hong Kong, the first British governors regarded local law enforcement as non-existent (Crisswell and Watson 1982), no matter how coherent some contemporary civil servants might regard those social norms (Falconer in Ceylon, quoted in Griffiths 1971). In essence the police was alien to the population. This imperial policy of "policing strangers by strangers" was conducted throughout the colonial domains: in India (Coy n.d quoted in Brogden 1987), in Ceylon (Dep 1979), in Hong Kong (Jeffries 1955), throughout the African colonies (Cramm 1969; Jeffries 1952; Foran 1962; and in the West Indies (Cramm 1969; Jeffries 1952). Further insulation from the local populace was guaranteed at command level. In England and Wales the officer ranks were predominantly filled at the outset by ex-soldiers who had already been alienated from the local habitat (Miller 1977; Steedman 1985). Throughout the colonies the officers were predominantly of British stock (Jeffries 1952; Bowden 1978). Policing practices were diffused by officers who started their careers in the Metropolitan Police or the Royal Irish Constabulary before being promoted to the supervision of a colonial force (Jeffries 1952) even taking the original training manual with them (Foran 1962). The summary justice that characterized the policing of the lower classes in Victorian England was commonly followed in the Colonies (Brogden 1987).

It was not until after the Second World War that the standards decreased once again. This was due to the fact that a number of Cypriots serving in the British army enlisted in the Cypriot police upon demilitarization. Another reason that contributed to the drop in academic standards was the fact that the Greek Cypriots were not favoured by the government and because they themselves did

not wish to be associated with British rule. So the Cyprus colonial government had to find law enforcers among the Turkish Cypriot population. The Greek Cypriots did not enlist in the police force because they were on the verge of an uprising (Note various movements for independence including the E.O.K.A. movement). In a way Greeks were defying and confronting British rule. The British applied the rule "Divide and rule". There is a significant point here to make as far as policing is concerned. Since the majority of police officers and constables were Turkish Cypriots, the Greek population did not turn to the police when victimized or to report a crime. This is partly why wrong doing continued to be solved within the community.

It was not until 1960 when Cyprus became independent that the composition of the Cypriot police changed. All paramilitary units were dissolved and their members were either compensated or allowed to enlist in the Cyprus police force.

The new composition of the force was 70% Greek and 30% Turkish Cypriot based on the constitutional agreement of independence. The above ratio reflected population segregation. In 1963 the Turkish Cypriot members of the force left on account of intercommunal conflicts on the island. From 1964 onwards, the Cypriot police force is homogeneous and consists mainly of Greek Cypriot officers and men. Some Maronites and Armenians serve also in the force.

With the formation of the National Guard the Cyprus police force added more weight on its shoulder by having to support it in terms of communications, transportation and manpower. For a number of years the Cyprus police had to support the National Guard. With all this weight the Cyprus police neglected some of its duties, and performance was inefficient.

Inefficiency was also recorded during the early 1970's

when the E.O.K.A. B' movement was conducting a campaign to destabilize the Makarios's government. The Cypriot police focused itself on protecting police and government buildings and personnel. In addition, they had to chase E.O.K.A. B' members all over the island. A large number of police officers were assigned with other duties; thus decreasing police performance as far as policing was concerned.

In 1974 the Cyprus police force suffered another much bigger blow with the stoping of the coup and the Turkish invasion. A number of police officers were killed both during the coup to overthrow the late president Makarios (15/7/74), and during the Turkish invasion (20/7/1974) that followed. Subsequently, large numbers of police officers man police stations along the so called "green line" demilitarized zone dividing the island, in order to bring confidence to the Greek Cypriots living near the line. Although the Cypriot police force is one of the largest in Europe in relation to its population (i.e. one police officer per 152 residents in camparison to 1:417 in England and Wales, 1:385 in France, 1:313 in Greece, 1:341 in Italy, 1:388 in West Germany, 1:340 in Spain (Hadjidemetriou 1983), it still cannot fulfil all its duties.

In addition to all the above mentioned setbacks which the Cypriot police force has suffered, it is presently facing another obstacle which drains manpower to duties other than public policing. I am referring to international terrorism and drug trafficking. Due to the geographical location of Cyprus, a number of terrorist organizations find Cyprus ideal for their schemes. Cyprus is close to the Lebanon, Israel, Turkey, Syria, Egypt. In addition, according to claims by foreigners, Cyprus is becoming a drug distribution centre. This is mainly due to the fact that Cyprus is the centre of a number of sea

routes (Cyprus police school publication, May 1982 lesson number 2).

Contemporary Development

It was not until the late 1980's that the Cypriot police force achieved a full 100% output with main concern the policing aspects of the population. They have modernized their fleet of mobile units, and maintain high standards of academic achievement among the new cadets including University graduates. In addition, higher technology in communications has been introduced and the police school has been upgraded. They have formed a special patrol unit and introduced computers for storage of data. Information technology (I.T.) is seen as part of a process of professionalization (Butler 1984); organization (Allen et al 1983); political control (Group 1985; Christian 1983; Mainwaring White 1983). However, I.T. has made little difference in decreasing crime or by increasing arrest and conviction rates (Kelling 1978; Kelling et al 1974; Reinier et al 1977). The benefits of I.T. have been so few while overreaction renders it useless (Hough 1985; Clarke and Hough 1980; Cotton 1977; 1978; Hough and Clarke 1980; Southgate 1985). In fact Greenwood et al (1976) notes that only 10% of arrests were made by detectives, the bulk being made by uniformed officers. The use of tape recorders in custodial interviews for example has apparently had no effect on the conduct of suspects (Willis et al 1989).

It is now possible to say that Cypriots feel more confident about their police and in some respects are proud of it. One aspect that suggests this, is the fact that over 1000 applicants apply every year to become police officers. As far as status is concerned, Cypriots consider a job with the police as prestigious. This is the result of years of conditioning towards the recognition of symbolic authority. The large number of applicants indicates that

the authorities will have a big pool to choose from in order to gain maximum qualifications. The above suggests that the Cypriot police is turning professional. Even professionalism has an effect on policing. Alderson (1985) maintains:

"By police professionalism I mean the idea that the role of the police in the social order becomes defined by the police. When the weakening of local influence is combined with professional certitude the way is open for police to become an institution in itself" (Alderson 1985 p.15).

Further evidence is provided by readings from independent research which investigate as to whether residents will assist a police officer in trouble: In Cyprus 59% of the sample replied "yes", which is the highest figure when compared to 17% in Austria, 18% in France, 42% in Italy, 16% in Germany, 33% in Norway, 30% in the Netherlands, 44% in Spain and 16% in Switzerland (Oris 1988).

Current Socio-Economic Changes Affecting Criminal Behaviour in Cyprus

It has already been stated that in the past the Cypriot police was not notified for offenses on account that these were dealt with by peers and family elders or because of alienation of the police itself. This provided time to the Cypriot police force to direct its efforts towards serious crime and functional issues.

This is not the case today because of the social rupture, the conflict in social norms and the challenge of values and tradition. In addition, displacement of population, urbanization, and disorganisation, brought conflict in the social contract.

In 1974, Greek Cypriots living in the northern part of

the island were forcibly uprooted and sent to the southern part of the island. In all, 170.000 persons were forcibly displaced, a total of one third of the population. The Greek Cypriot side faced an acute shortage of houses to accommodate all the refugees. Subsequently erected refugee housing estates all over the southern part of the island in order to house all refugees. Priority was given to people in need irrespective of social class, area or village of origin. This is why today the refugee housing estates comprise people from different socioeconomic backgrounds and place of origin. People from different backgrounds came to live together in a community which to them was strange and novel. Conflict was inevitable because the values of some people who originated from area A conflicted with the values of people who originated from area B.

"Changes in environmental design, management quotation and social mix appear to work together to encourage the growth of informal social control or of criminality" (Hope and Foster 1992 p. 501).

Some explanations for the increase of criminality in Cyprus were focused on the role of the design of R.H.E. fostering defensive or territorial behaviour among residents (Newman 1973); creating opportunities for the commission of offences (Clarke and Mayhew 1980); encouraging general 'social malaise' (Coleman 1985); concentration of social disadvantage (Wilson 1987; Crane 1991); causal relationships (Heseltine 1991; Wilson 1991; Murray 1990); interdependence of the above factors suggested by Hope (1986); Rock (1988); and Power (1989). However, estates differ according to location (Hope and Haugh 1988; Baldwin and Bottoms 1976; Bottoms et al 1987, 1989). Explanation is also given through the 'Internal dynamics' of community change (Greenberg et al 1985;

Rosenbaum 1988). Because there is no continuity in the succession of generations in the refugee housing estates, through the raising of the young people it is not possible to maintain values (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990; Kornhausen 1978). These values form "collective conscience" which uphold social order. On the other hand research shows that it is very difficult to describe the sequences of cause and effect linking the deterioration of urban neighbourhoods to changes in their crime levels, because many adverse characteristics are likely to interact over time in the process of decline or renewal (Skogan 1990; Hope and Shaw 1988; Taylor and Gottfredson 1986; Taub et al 1984).

Not only has there been a fracture in traditional society but what has happened in Cyprus is that the criminal sub-culture as defined by Wolfgang and Farracuti (1967), was displaced on account of both the 1963 and 1974 reallocations of the population. As a result of this move, criminal subcultures sprang all over the place. However, there is also a transfer of criminal behaviour shifting from serious crime, such as homicides, to crimes against property. The probability theory of Merton (1938) explains part of the cause. An expansion in consumerism leads to more chances of either theft or fraud. It is the case where the temptation to steal is greater than before, because today there is something worth stealing i.e. car, bicycle, effects. This is a reasonable account considering the socioeconomic differences between displaced and non-displaced population. Organised crime does not exist in Cyprus, suggesting that the majority of the property-oriented crimes are not instigated by gangs or groups of delinquents.

However, different correlates of criminal behaviour are found at different ages (Farrington 1981a) and subsequently different factors may modify the course of

development of criminality, (Stattin et al 1989).

The Cypriot society has seen a lot of revelations as a consequence of the social and economic development, including urbanization, industrialization, as well as the war. However, it still maintains those ingredients to organize the city-village concept.

Cyprus offers also unique opportunities to study the city-village concept of Alderson (1979). This concept insinuates that sociologically speaking the city functions on the principles of life in a village, taking into consideration the "collective conscience", moral code, social roles, values and beliefs that exist among the inhabitants. All these constitute that social structure which maintains informal law and order.

Cypriot cities portray all those ingredients in making the city-village concept possible. Kinship, strong moral code and neighbourhoodness define the margins of social order. Due to the sociological make-up of the Cypriot culture, it is true to say that cities offer settings similar to the city-village concept in contrast to other Western cities.

"But each new state of metropolitan development reveals grave and fundamental structural defects at all levels of society and tremendous problems of alienation and social conflict that grew in virulence with quickening tempo of change" (Blair 1974 p.71).

Social conflict has many meanings, such as the fracture in "collective conscience" or the disorganization in social contract (Durkheim 1950), conflict in opportunities (Merton 1963) or conflict in conduct norms (Sellin 1938) etc. Indeed the city-village principle affects the level of crime and it also prevents deviancy based on the collectivity that exists in the social

contract. In addition, the system defines what is deviant and what is not, also it regulates the role of law enforcing agents.

"The members of the community defined for him what was trivial and what was important. What was real police work and what was not" (Alderson 1979 p.187).

Maurine Cain (1972) gives more definitions on the ascribed role of the police in a rural village in Britain. Another issue which is much evident in the city-village is the fact that in such situations social tolerance to deviancy (Sparks, Genn and Dodd 1977) is greater than other urbanized areas.

This study will attempt to show that Cypriot urbanized population, in the face of the social disorganization and the fracture in the social contract, inhabitants will still have those unique social qualities which initiate conformity and obedience to a strong moral code.

Although the social fracture is evident in the social structure, the magnitude of it is outweighed by the strong sense of cohesiveness on matters of moral code.

After going through various topics in the presentation of the Cypriot identity, I am in a position to identify the main factors which can influence the formation of the above concept. These are:

1. Limited alienation and anomie in the society
2. Economic stability
3. Social values.
4. Acceptance of the police.
5. Strong social deterrence against crime.
6. Limited tolerance to crime.

Although this survey is not in a position to quantify the extent of the above factors, it can, however, describe

the various effects.

I must say that in Cyprus today people are clustered socially in a number of ways 1. Kinship, 2. Geography, 3. Comradeship. As a result criminality is easily identified and deterred.

The people enjoy economic stability with only 2-5% of the working force unemployed. This really contains social conflict which again is a source of antisocial behaviour. This evolves from Marx who depicts that crime against property is an outcome of either absolute or relative deprivation (Bohm 1983; Braithwaite 1979; Lean and Young 1984). Control theorists maintain that individuals who are excluded from the mainstream of society remain free to offend (Box 1981, 1987); the outsiders (Becker 1963) and Strain theorists describe offenders as frustrated in their efforts to acquire social acceptance through gainful employment (Cohen 1955). Work in the public sphere is thought to define the main role of the person: it supplies the means by which one achieves an acceptable standard of living and it provides an entry into respectable society. Unemployment is perceived as such a calamity that it provokes criminal activity. It expresses itself in a range of street crimes, in crimes of violence and in property offending (Braithwaite 1979; Tarling 1982; Farrington et al 1986).

Social values offer ample ground to deter antisocial behaviour mainly reinforced by the network of kinship. A footnote must be placed here concerning general deterrence and capital punishment. During the decades 1930s, 1940s, 1950s the number of murders amounted to 30-40 per year (Clifford 1954a) and the colonial rules applied the death sentence in order to deter the offence of homicide, (Ehrlich 1975, 1976a, 1976b, 1977a, 1977b, 1979; Ehrlich et al 1977). The last death sentence was carried out in 1961 while the then President Archbishop Makarios was out of

the Country showing his dissatisfaction with the sentence. Currently, the homicide rate in Cyprus ranges from 5-10 per year (whole population) much less than the time when capital punishment was enforced. This issue challenges the Ehrlich argument and supports the issue of "collective conscience" as far as the offence of homicide is concerned. It must be noted, however, that currently in Cyprus there are signs of organized crime which is involved in murders in furtherance of death contracts.

Finally, there is evidence which shows that the policemen enjoy high respect on account that this is the first time the Cypriots in their contemporary history are policed by an indigenous to their culture authority. Respect also derives from the satisfaction of performance. However, satisfaction of police performance is not the single factor which regulates police behaviour. The deduction derives from the fact that the British police force enjoys respect and approval but crime as well as public relations are unmanageable. As a matter of reference, extremely high levels of approval were recorded by Belson (1975). Honesty and ethical standards of the police officers were rated second only to those of doctors and ahead of solicitors, businessmen and M.P.s (Sunday Times Poll "Mori 1980"); 9/10ths of a national sample said that they had a fair or great amount of confidence in the police (Observer N.O.P 1981). Furthermore, those with friends or relatives in the police are more favourable (Sparks et al 1977). Considering the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Cypriots have friends and relatives in the police, it is no wonder why the Cypriots register great satisfaction. Contradicting results as far as difference in the satisfaction level of men and women are presented by the B.C.S. and Belson (1975); Garofalo (1978). The actual experience with the police (rather than a respondent's personal characteristics such as age and

sex) is the single most important correlate of attitude (Scaglione and Condon 1980).

In Cyprus today, police authorities demand from the government of Cyprus (by applying to the Finance and Home Committees of the House of Representatives) an additional budget to employ another 500 special police officers. This alone will bring the density to around 133:1. It is not certain that an increase in police density will decrease crime or eliminate fear. The main objective of the police should be to improve relations with the public and not to deter crime with police density. One common assumption is that the way to improve police-public relations is simply to increase the amount of contact between them, normally by returning more officers to foot beat. However, the Policy Studies Institute (1983) reports that this alone is not enough and that even apparently "positive" contacts may sometimes harm relations. The B.C.S. also showed that it is not merely the amount of contact but its quality that determines people's reactions. Putting more officers on the streets could simply boost arrest for minor offences worsening relations with the public and overloading the criminal justice system further unless those officers were to be directed away from that type of activity and more thoroughly trained in social skills (Southgate 1982).

Because of the recent break-up of the "collective conscience" as far as social order is concerned, the police authorities in Cyprus must initiate artificial bonding with the public. Some policy suggestions include 1) The creation of crime prevention schemes: West Germany (Schenk 1981), Japan (Bayley 1976), 2) Introducing specialist community involvement officers or home beat constables whose brief is to develop friendly contact. However, this might be seen by some as "Whitewashing" (McDowell 1971) and might serve only to emphasize a divergence of approaches within the police (Jones 1980 and Brown 1981). It is

important to ensure that individual police officers have balanced experiences of the public as victims, participants in civil conflicts, and adversaries (Bayley 1976) rather than seeing them predominantly as one or the other.

METHODOLOGY

Earlier on I have presented a list of propositions and arguments which need to be tested or verified with some form of empirical data. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct some form of research which will offer verification and validity to the said propositions. Choosing the right methodology is a matter of negotiating science, sample structure and application of questionnaire.

At this point it is necessary to point out that it is not the intention of this study to test any single theory but merely to explain some sociological phenomena with the help of social theory.

Stinchcombe (1968) declares that the more propositions tested the stronger the test and verification of the imposed arguments. Initially it was the functionalist and up to one extent Durkheim's "social fact" techniques that started the process of explaining social phenomena. Opposing the argument of explaining social phenomena (behaviour) with empirical data either through recorded data or observed data, is the social radicalism school of Jock Young (1973) which states that social behaviour is complex and is a function not only on human aspects but also a function of definition of behaviour. The issue of applying observations to theoretical frames is a major concern to social thought because it is an avenue by which science can explain social behaviour.

The individual predisposition theorists Lombroso (1911) and Eyseck (1964) used extensively the method of data analysis to support their arguments. The same can be said, to a certain extent, about the sociological determinant approach. For Durkheim, who represented the archetypical sociological positivism, society is an external constraining reality, and "social facts", such as crime, could be explained in these terms. However, the

micro-sociology approach of New criminology rejects the hard quantitative data associated with official statistics, surveys, and experiments in favour of the more appreciative data of observational and life-history styles.

Qualitative research seeks to collect data and it is a very broad and general category and it encompasses a wide range of research activities and styles. It is an ethnographic tradition which gives primacy to descriptions and explanations which are derived from data collected about the actor's point of view of his or her social situation. Qualitative research has been associated with the influence of micro-sociological theories (Bryman 1988).

Since this study investigates social disorganization within the social context, it is necessary to look at human behaviour with reference to social interaction. Therefore, it is necessary to record social facts which first need to be defined as crime and secondly to explain social disorganization through deviancy. Crime is considered as a product of such disorganization.

Two methods can be applied to measure crime. One relates to published criminal statistics and the other relates to the generation of data through survey. Durkheim has argued strongly for the use of official statistics as indicators of "social facts". The positivist assumption of treating aspects of social life as "objective" measurable phenomena can be found in his famous edict to "treat social facts as things" (Durkheim 1964b). In "Suicide" Durkheim (1952) he used official statistics to study and explain variations in the suicide rate. Durkheim did not himself extend the use of official statistics to the study of crime while the implications were easy to see. The broad methodological tradition he laid down was carried by others. The extent to which one can rely on official statistics to measure the extent of crime or a basis for

explanation, represents one of the classic disputes in criminology (Anglian 1982).

Another view is that of the realism approach founded by the positivist supposition that official statistics represent objective indicators of the level of crime and the number of offenders in society of any given point in time. Despite this, it is recognized that there are certain technical problems with official statistics, principally the inability to include the 'dark figure' of crime (Bottomley 1979). In general, statistics as well as crime surveys, are seen as products of the criminal justice system and specifically as indicators of the activities of those who work with it (Kitsuse and Cicourel 1963; Cicourel 1976).

The determination to investigate the issue of social disorganisation through crime readings is reinforced by Jump (1933):

"Crime is a multifaceted phenomenon ... It is an act which is capable of being counted and it is also a way of life requiring detailed and sensitive description" (Jump 1933 p.34).

Others have considered:

"Crime and Criminal action as a medium through which to examine problems which are fundamental to social science discipline (Marsh, Rosser and Hawe' 1978).

In view of the use of crime survey information to assess how much crime different countries have is attractive, particularly as national survey results are already available for a number of countries, including England and Wales, and Scotland. The problems involved, however, should not be underestimated. By large, crime surveys today have been independently conceived and organised, resulting in differences in sampling, field

procedures, response rates, "screening" methods, offence coverage and definitions etc, which can be as tricky to handle as the differences underlying official statistics. So far, only a handful of criminologists have tackled the problems involved though with some illuminating results (Clinard 1978; Braithwaite and Biles 1979; Srevi 1982; van Digk and Steinmetz 1983; Hough 1983; Skogan 1984; Mayhew and Smith 1985).

Social surveys as opposed to criminal statistics have been used extensively in examining many features and problems within the criminological enterprise. The Cambridge Studies of Delinquency (West 1967, 1969, 1982); Assess public attitude towards policing strategies and practices of the Metropolitan Police (Smith and Cray 1983); Investigating occupational groups within the criminal justice system (Cain 1973); Compare the policeman's role in urban and rural areas, (Jones 1979).

The surveys that bear significance to this study are those which investigate the extent and patterns of crime. Such include estimates of 'dark figures' of crime by the use of victim survey. To name a few: The British Crime Survey (Hough and Mayhem 1983, 1985) and the Islington Crime Survey (Jones, Maclean and Young 1986), Early crime surveying was carried out by Van Hentig (1948), The United States President's Crime Commission (Ennis 1967; Sparks et al 1977), and the Scottish Crime Survey by Chambers and Tombs (1984).

As far as crime surveying is concerned, there are two methods of investigation:

1. Self reporting studies
2. Victim survey

In the former, samples of individuals are asked to provide information about their involvement in crimes of

various types in a period of time. Subjects are asked to admit offenses. Such surveys include those conducted in the United States (Clarke and Tifft 1966; Empey and Erickson 1966; Hirshi 1969; and Johnson 1979); in Scandinavia (Antilla and Jaakola 1966; Elmhorn 1965); and in England and Wales, social class and reporting, (McDonald 1969); stealing by boys in areas of London, (Belson 1969, 1975), and part of the Cambridge Studies of Delinquency project (West and Farrington 1973). However, such surveys portray a moral as well as a practical problem. In the above studies it was shown that admissions were overreported. In addition, confession to serious crime presents a moral issue to the researcher whether he should report the offence to the authorities if it has not been brought to the attention of the police.

On the other hand, victim surveys are widely used nowadays because they present fewer methodological problems. Basically, victim surveys involve the recall of victimization from a representative sample from the population. See von Henting (1948); Ennis (1967); Sparks et al (1977); Jones, Maclean and Young (1986); Chambers and Tombs (1984). The main problem with such studies is the perceived triviality of the offences. The merit of such approach is the fact that it provides insights into the subject's reason for not reporting crimes. Also such surveys cannot collect data about victimless crimes or about certain types of crime and so called "crimes of the powerful" (Walklate 1989).

Other methods of research investigation include the following:

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Experiment: | Reforms as Experiments (Canberll 1969) |
| | Crime control in Britain (Brating Clark and Cornish 1983) |

Observation: Ethnography of the hobo area of Chicago (Anderson 1923).
Thrasher's study of gangs. (Thrasher 1928)
Sentenced to Labour (Vass 1984)
Drug taking (Young 1971).

Informal Interview: Documents of life (Plummer 1983).
The Jack Raller (Show 1930).
Sex offenders (Parker 1965).
Five female criminals (Parker 1965)
Middle class criminal (Parker 1965)

The above methods are considered as qualitative and do not offer ground for generalization.

Before describing the method by which I will collect data to verify earlier proposition, it is necessary to state that whatever method of research is used, one has to be careful in interpreting relations and associations of variables. An incorrect jump from relationship of one variable to another will lead to a "fallacy of the wrong level"

"In general, the fallacy of the wrong level consists not in making inferences from one level of analysis to another, but in making direct translation of properties or relations from one level to another, i.e. making too simple inferences" (Galtung 1967 p.45).

Alker (1969) states that fallacy of the wrong level can be committed upwards by projecting incorrectly from properties of individuals to properties of groups or other collectivities of which they are part. When two variables correlate with each other it does not mean that one affects the other. A third variable which is called "spurious" might be responsible, for example, crime and unemployment

are associates with urbanization. So one variable affects the other (Blalock 1961, 1969, 1971; Heise 1969, 1975; Tarling 1979). The essence of this point is the difficulty of associating social disorganisation with a particular variable or reason.

Having decided to use a victim crime survey to register the amount of crime and the attitude towards formal policing it is necessary to apply this as scientifically as possible so that results can maintain some degree of validity. A survey is not synonymous with a particular technique of collecting information (Marsh 1982). In addition, de Vaus D.A. (1991) states that research method depends, or rather criticism can be made on philosophical, and political grounds as well as on the technique.

"When you actually do research you will find that you are not doing what you should" (de Vaus 1991 p.9).

As far as reliability is concerned, it is necessary to consider a) Source of unreliability, b) Testing of reliability, and c) Increased reliability.

Surveys can be conducted according to probability and random samples, or non probability and quota samples. Each technique is applicable to a specific situation according to the degree of representativeness of the sample. With references to probability sampling, there are three major methods a) Simple random sample b) Systematic sampling c) Stratified sample (de Vaus 1991, 1965). As far as the non-probability sample is concerned, there are three major methods a) Quota sample (Moser and Kylton 1971), b) availability sample, and c) Purposive sampling. The difference between the probability and the non-probability sampling is that the former method, although more accurate,

is time consuming, expensive and also finding adequate frames to draw a sample is a problem. Probability samples are more accurate with a considerable small sample. On the other hand, non-probability sample is cheap and inexpensive because there is no need to recall, simply because there can be no substitution and therefore it can be completed in less time. Selection of respondents is based on quotas sampling. The negativeness of this method relates to the low credibility of representativeness of the sample.

This survey will use a probability sample technique in order to specify locations and then, using a Multistage cluster technique (Kish 1949, 1965), define starting points. Clustering will be achieved according to the density of population or natural geo-political boundaries. However, lacking adequate sample frames (note conscription of males age 18-20, students travelling abroad 20-29 year olds, urbanization, and because electoral catalogue lists only people over 21 years of age of the population, there is a need to adopt a strict quota sampling. It is expected that a large sample will justify the method as a credible one. This survey consists of 430 questionnaires.

"In practise a key determinant of sample size is the need to look separately at different subgroups. Make sure that the sample is sufficiently so that when it is broken down into separate subgroups (age, sex, class) there will be sufficient numbers in each. As a rule of thumb try to ensure that the smallest subgroup has at least 50 to 100 cases" (Hoinville et al. 1977 p. 61).

With the administration of the questionnaire to the sample it is necessary to bear in mind certain principles as far as interviewing is concerned.

It is understood that there is a distinction of four different types of question content. Behaviour, beliefs, attitudes, and attributes. It is possible that one

questionnaire will have all types of questions. (Dillman 1978). As far as comprehension is concerned, the language (in this case Greek) is simple (Gowers 1962; Strunk and White 1972) and easily understood. Questions are short, and not leading to double meaning. There are two types of questions:

- a) Open formats
- b) Close formats.

Open formats require qualitative responses while close formats usually require a predefined answer. For key variables I use a combination of open and closed question (Gallup 1947).

Before administering the questionnaire to the sample, care has been taken to pilot test the consistency and contingency of the questionnaire. Twenty respondents participated in the piloting of the survey. After initial testing problems were recalled by the interviewers and readjustments were made to the questionnaire (Converse and Presser 1976).

The questionnaire required face to face interview on account that this method has the highest response rate for both quantitative and qualitative (Stench 1981). However, cost is higher when compared with telephone or post interviews (Dillman 1978).

"But for a small local community survey, the relative cost of the various methods can be very similar" (de Vaus 1991 p.112).

One major obstacle which can alter the readings of the survey is the no response element.

" Assuming good technique we will still set about 20% no-response" (de Vaus 1991 p. 73).

This survey is no exception. Although care has been taken in carefully training the interviewers (Hoinvill et al 1977) the problem still remained (is much evident). Even the large size of the sample was ineffective to the no-response factor. Non-respondents are usually older or subjects with lower education.

Detailed analysis of the survey's sample structure and method of administration of the questionnaire is presented in the section of the survey procedure.

SURVEY PROCEDURE

Location

The survey was conducted in the district of Nicosia in Cyprus. The survey covered urban centres as well as rural areas.

Field dates

The whole questionnaire process lasted two weeks from July 7 to July 22 1985. On average each interviewer conducted 10-15 interviews per day, depending on the distance he had to travel to reach the next starting point.

Questionnaire design

One of the objects of the survey was to identify the amount of crime in Cyprus. For this reason I have been inclined to use a victimization survey rather than any other form of empirical research. I am aware that even with victimization surveys there are some disadvantages mainly referring to the sincerity of the victims to report truthfully forms of victimization. Some respondents will decline to report their victimization while others will exaggerate their victimization. In any case, victimization surveys have been used widely (note British Crime Surveys) in order to estimate the extent of dark figures of crime.

The questionnaire lasted about 30 minutes and included both:

1. Open-ended questions
2. Set-choice questions.

The questionnaire was translated into Greek. (Note appendix for questionnaire).

Sampling

Before carrying out the victimization survey in

Cyprus, I have weighed the pros and cons of various sampling methods. All the time the main concern was to produce representative data which will reflect the people's attitude towards the object in question.

Certainly, the survey had to be based on the principle of randomized sampling, if it expected to earn some validity and at the same time eliminate bias. Going through the various techniques of random sampling I have concluded that none will really be applicable to the case of Cyprus. Inevitably, I must apply a combination of techniques.

Following are some methods which I have considered and also the merits and disadvantages of each one of them.

Randomized Method

In order to apply such technique it was necessary to select by chance from a complete list of the population known as the "Sampling Frame" i.e.

1. Lottery tickets
2. Tables of Random numbers or selected units
3. Computerized random procedures.

This type of technique, unfortunately, is costly, time consuming and impractical. The main obstacle is in finding adequate frames by which to draw samples. Although there are electoral catalogues, these are not useful on account of:

1. The electoral register records people 18 years old and above only.
2. The electoral register includes all males 18-20 years of age who are on national service. These males are hard to reach on account that they are posted away from home. Military service in Cyprus is compulsory and this is a major problem in randomizing the sample.
3. The electoral register also includes males and females 20-25 years old who are abroad studying. It has to

be mentioned that most of the young people travel abroad to further or finish their education. The 1980 statistical abstracts show that the age group 20-24 years has a total of 64.200 people. The same statistics show that in any year there are around 12000 students abroad.

In essence the age group 18-24 is unrepresented in the above mentioned technique of Sampling. For the above reason I have decided not to use the randomized selection technique for this survey.

Systematic Selection

This technique is termed to be the base of the selection process, employed in this survey. Although I was facing the disproportionality of the young generation in the country, this method guaranteed a partial removal of human judgement in selecting respondents. This method determined the selection of the units, i.e.:

1. Taking every nth name in a list at N/n intervals where N is the population size and n is the sample size.

2. Taking every nth house in a list at N/n intervals where N is the sum of houses and n is the sample size.

The second technique was more attractive to me on account that the electoral register has also a street index per municipality and quarters.

However, obstacles in the employment of this technique related to the migration of the population in the summer to holiday resorts. In addition, the remaining population that stay in the city confine themselves indoors in order to avoid the midday sun. It is unthinkable in the summer to knock on somebody's door between the hours 1-4 in the afternoon. This time the people sleep or relax.

The only available time to conduct interviewing is between 4 in the afternoon until 8 in the evening when it is possible to find all or at least most of the people of the household indoors.

Quota Sampling

This is generally regarded by statisticians as "non-probability" or "non-random" sampling. This is mainly because the final selection of respondents is made by the interviewer, so human judgement enters into the selection process. The interviewer, instead of being issued with a pre-selected list of names and addresses, is given an assignment in the form of a quota. It is often left to the interviewer how he or she goes about finding respondents who meet these requirements in the sampling point. This leaves open the possibility of the interviewer avoiding certain types of locations or types of people, and so there is a systematic difference between one interviewer and another.

Clearly this technique involves human judgement which in effect multiplies bias in selection. On account of the above restrictions which I have encountered when considering random sampling, it was necessary at one stage to employ this technique in order to have a representative sample. Refusing to apply quotas meant that I should use weighing factors in order to maintain proportional responses. Considering that I did not expect to interview a sufficient number of 18-24 year olds to create a base to apply weights, I have reconsidered initial thoughts on quotas.

Researcher Selection

My involvement in selecting starting points was unavoidable on account that practicality, speed, and objectivity had to be the main essentials of the survey. Although my intentions were to use proportionality in developing a sampling frame I had to exclude population from certain mountainous regions of Nicosia because these villages are almost depopulated. Young people prefer to reside in urban or suburban areas, places close to their work.

In conclusion, I have stratified the sample according to municipality, quarter, and head village. It was necessary to cluster operations according to geographic location in order to maintain a cross-section of some variables enquired.

Stratification of Sample

The effect of this procedure was to reduce to some extent the impact of random sampling error and to yield estimates with a smaller standard error than would emerge from an unstratified sample. The key stratification factor used is the region. The selection of sampling points is "stratified by region". The selection is done within each region so that the number of sampling points in each reflects its population size. This keeps the sample in line with the regional distribution of the population.

Because equal numbers of responses were allocated to each interviewer at each sampling point, the selection of the points within the region were "probability proportional to size". This means that the sampling points with more people in them were given a higher probability of selection.

Design of Selection procedure

Having studied the above sampling techniques, I came to the conclusion that none will be applicable to the Cyprus setting for various reasons. For this state I was tempted to use a combination of techniques aiming always at the elimination of bias.

I have decided to use the quota sampling technique based on systematic selection procedure within random location.

The merits: Quota sampling is quicker, easier and cheaper than random sampling, since no callbacks are required and

its administration is simple. Furthermore, since each interviewer continues until his/her quotas of sexes, ages are filled, there is no "no-response" rate, so the exact size and basic structure of the sample can be determined in advance, and the desired size of sample is always achieved.

It is widely believed that the results given by quota sampling are reasonably close to those obtained from random sampling.

The defects: Quota samples are less accurate because they are not selected at random. The bias resulting from interviewer selection is considerable, if not controlled.

Application of improvement measures

1. Quotas were "interlaced" so that individuals or households who combined various characteristics were selected by the interviewer in such numbers that together all the interviewers ensure that overall targets were met. Quota targets were derived by the national census of 1982. The census gave the most accurate breakdown of the demographic structure of Cyprus.
2. Geographic areas were selected as sampling points in such a way that they were representative of the universe. Within each area systematic sampling was imposed. This removed from the interviewer discretion over whom to interview and made the sample selected representative of the area in which the sampling took place, rather than being in accordance with arbitrary quota controls.
3. When in random location, the interviewers were instructed to call at every 4th house in predefined starting points. The interviewer was given instructions in advance as to which direction to turn at road junctions and again applying the same systematic selection technique.
4. Only one interview per household.

5. The Sample

| | TOTAL POPULAT. | S/P | QUOTA | SAMPLE |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|--------|
| <u>NICOSIA DISTRICT</u> | 209154 | 22 | 400 | 430 |
| <u>NICOSIA TOWN REGION</u> | 147648 | | | |
| NICOSIA MUNICIPALITY | 47945 | 5 | 100 | 56 |
| Ayios Andreas | 5840 | 2 | 40 | 23 |
| Tripiotis | 3227 | | | |
| Nebet Khane | 156 | | | |
| Tabak Khane | 259 | | | |
| Phaneromeni | 435 | | | |
| Ayios Savvas | 842 | | | |
| Omerie | 302 | | | |
| Ayios Antonios | 4989 | | | |
| Ayios Ioannis | 458 | | | |
| Takht-El-Kale | 624 | | | |
| Khrysaliniotissa | 269 | | | |
| Ayios Kassaianos | 64 | | | |
| Kaimakli | 10411 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
| Panayia | 8452 | 1 | 20 | 13 |
| Ayios Konst.-Ayia Eleni | 2540 | | | |
| Ayii Omologites | 8851 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
| Arab Ahmet Pasha | 22 | | | |
| Jeni Jami | 199 | | | |
| <u>NICOSIA SUBURBAN AREA</u> | 74025 | 10 | 200 | 233 |
| Ayios Pavlos | 2857 | 1 | 20 | 24 |
| Ayios Yeorgios | 10539 | 2 | 40 | 41 |
| Engomi(Makedonitissa) | 5769 | 2 | 40 | 39 |
| <u>Strovolos Area</u> | | | | |
| -Khryseleousa | 11108 | 2 | 40 | 40 |
| -Ayios Demetrios | 8434 | 2 | 40 | 33 |
| -Ap.Varnavas/Makarios | 7405 | 1 | 20 | 24 |
| -Ayios Vasilios | 9506 | | | |
| -Ethnomartyros Kyprianos | 3339 | 1 | 20 | 20 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|----|----|
| -Stavros | 2341 | | | |
| Aglandja | 12727 | | | 12 |
| <u>NICOSIA GREATERURBAN</u> | 25678 | 3 | 60 | 63 |
| Lakatamia* | | | | |
| -Kato Lakatamia | 8591 | | | 10 |
| -Ayios Nicolaos | 2466 | | | |
| -Anthoupolis | 4657 | 1 | 20 | 11 |
| Laxia Quarters* | | | | |
| -Ayios Yeorgios | 3037 | 1 | 20 | 19 |
| -Ayios Eleftherios | 3237 | 1 | 20 | 25 |
| -Arch.Michael | 1237 | | | |
| Yeri* | 2453 | | | |
| <u>KYTHREA REGION</u> | 13215 | 1 | 20 | 26 |
| <u>NISOU AREA</u> | | | | |
| Sha | 36 | | | |
| Mathiati | 390 | | | |
| Alambra | 726 | | | |
| Ayia Varvara | 1027 | | | |
| Kochati | 286 | | | |
| Nisou | 832 | | | |
| Pera Khorio | 1650 | | | |
| Dhali | 3877 | 1 | 20 | 26 |
| Lymbia | 1723 | | | |
| Lythrodondas | 1870 | | | |
| <u>TYMBOU AREA</u> | | | | |
| Potamia | 465 | | | |
| <u>ORINI REGION</u> | 22254 | 3 | 60 | 50 |
| <u>KLIROU AREA</u> | | | | |
| Kambi Pharmakas | 163 | | | |
| Pharmakas | 532 | | | |
| Apliki Orinis | 115 | | | |
| Lazania | 32 | | | |
| Gouri | 281 | | | |
| Phikardou | 13 | | | |
| Ayios Epiphaniou | 348 | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|---|----|----|
| Kato Khorio | 456 | | | |
| Malounda | 285 | | | |
| Klirou | 1306 | | | |
| Aredhiou | 708 | | | |
| Ayios Ioannis | 337 | | | |
| Agrokipia | 380 | | | |
| Mitsero | 704 | | | |
| <u>DEFTERA AREA</u> | | | | |
| Kapedes | 364 | | | |
| Analiondas | 212 | | | |
| Kambia | 334 | | | |
| Margi | 59 | | | |
| Tseri | 2455 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
| Politico | 284 | | | |
| Pera | 861 | | | |
| Episkopio | 403 | | | |
| Psimolophou | 846 | | | |
| Ergates | 1121 | | | |
| Anayia | 761 | | | |
| Pano Deftera | 1360 | | | |
| Kato Deftera | 711 | | | |
| <u>KOKKINOTRIMITHIA AREA</u> | | | | |
| Ayii Trimithias | 857 | | | |
| Paleometochos | 2778 | 1 | 20 | 24 |
| Dhenia | 188 | | | |
| Kokkinotrimithia | 2024 | 1 | 20 | 16 |
| Mammari | 951 | | | |
| <u>MORPHOU REGION</u> | | | | |
| <u>PALEKHORI AREA</u> | | | | |
| Palekhori | 757 | | | |
| Askas | 321 | | | |
| Alona | 367 | | | |
| Phterikoudhi | 230 | | | |
| Polystipos | 385 | | | |
| Lagoudera | 221 | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Sarandi | 92 |
| Livadhia | 51 |
| Alithinou | 22 |
| Platanistasa | 390 |
| Palekhorì | 546 |
| <u>KOUTRAFA AREA</u> | |
| Xyliatos | 122 |
| Ayios Yeorgios | 21 |
| Nikitari | 520 |
| Vyzakia | 440 |
| Ayia Marina | 608 |
| Kato Moni | 313 |
| Orounda | 789 |
| Kato Koutraphas | 43 |
| Potami | 504 |
| <u>KATOKOPIA AREA</u> | |
| Akaki | 2163 |
| Peristerona | 2261 |
| Astromeritis | 2062 |
| Meniko | 887 |
| <u>LEFKA REGION</u> | 11922 |
| <u>SOLEA AREA</u> | |
| Spilia | 307 |
| Ayia Erini | 56 |
| Kannavia | 219 |
| Kakopetria | 1403 |
| Ayios Theodoros | 153 |
| Galata | 962 |
| Sina oros | 224 |
| Kaliana | 277 |
| Tembria | 837 |
| Korakou | 618 |
| Evrychou | 976 |
| Kato Phlasou | 379 |
| Pano Phlasou | 55 |

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Linou | 332 |
| Katydata | 287 |
| Skouriotissa | 40 |

MARATHASA AREA

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Pedhoulas | 494 |
| Milikouri | 145 |
| Moutoulas | 525 |
| Ikos | 241 |
| Kalopanayiotis | 580 |
| Yerakies | 330 |
| Tsakistra | 148 |
| Kambos | 739 |

TYLLIRIA AREA

| | |
|-------------|------|
| Pano Pyrgos | 72 |
| Kato Pyrgos | 1017 |
| Piyenia | 297 |
| Pakhyammos | 176 |
| Mosphileri | 33 |

* Lakatamia, Laxia and Yeri are considered as head villages.

It is shown that no interviewing was conducted in the Morphou and Lefka Regions of Nicosia. In both regions the population is 26037 spread over 53 villages. The reasons for the exclusion from the sample have already been mentioned. In conclusion the population frame for the district of Nicosia is $209154 - 26037 = 183117$.

The 1982 Household study indicated that in Nicosia the residents make up 42% of the whole population of Cyprus.

I have decided to contact 400 or more questionnaires on the basis that age quotas were divided into 10 groups, and I was hoping to get at least 40 respondents from every age group so that each one would have a representative figure compatible to the universe.

Furthermore, I have allocated 20 S.P. according to the

proportionality of the population of the region or the subdivision of the area. It was required that at each S.P. the interviewers had to complete 20 questionnaires according to the provided quotas. The quotas attempted to reach as many people from different sex and age groups.

Starting points per area were selected from the electoral street name list. All streets were numbered from 1 to nth number and, using plain number recall technique, streets were selected.

However, the main setback of the above technique was the fact that Nicosia is a small city and often random selection of location was near a boundary. Although much care was taken to avoid clustering, to some extent it was unavoidable. Small cities like Nicosia have no clearly marked boundaries of the various municipalities or city quarters. The same problems are also present when applying sampling techniques in big cities.


Sampling procedure

1. Urban Sampling: The interviewers always started on the left hand side of the street per starting point. They were instructed to call on every 4th successful household. In Cyprus there is the custom for kinship to share either the same quarters, or build houses next to each other. In order to avoid clustering and have a better spread of the sample, I have decided to follow this systematic procedure.
2. Rural Sampling: Once the location was selected i.e. head village, the starting point was always the centre, the village square or the church. This was the rule because in villages there are no street names or any other noticeable random frames. Again the interviewers had to use the same systematic technique.


Field Controls

The survey was completed in a very short period. This was due to the fact that two assistants helped with the interviewing. Including myself, there were three interviewers who participated in the study. The names of the other two were Constantinos and Leonidas, both students of Higher education. The interviewers were paid six Cypriot pounds per day.

Both interviewers received training as to how to contact interviews, what procedures to follow and how to select subjects for interview. The survey was supervised by myself, in addition to monitoring its progress. I was receiving questionnaires daily and at the same time I was editing and conducting backchecks in order to verify answers or to ask for clarification. In all, 37 questionnaires were B.C. Twenty one questionnaires were rejected and not included in the data because they were either incomplete or the interviewer was interrupted by a third person, making it impossible to continue with the interview.



ALLOCATION OF STARTING POINTS IN THE DISTRICT OF NICOSIA



ALLOCATION OF STARTING POINTS IN THE MUNICIPALITY AND SUBURBS OF NICOSIA




Table M1. Detail table showing the distribution of sex per age per area studied.

AGE PER SEX

| AREA | 15-19 | | 20-24 | | 25-29 | | 30-34 | | 35-39 | | 40-44 | | 45-49 | | 50-54 | | 55-59 | | 60+ | |
|-------------------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-----|----|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Nicosia | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | | | |
| Acropolis | 3 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 |
| Egkomi | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | 4 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Ay.Omologites | | | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Dasoupolis | 2 | | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | | 2 | 3 | | | 2 | 2 |
| Ay.Pavlos | 2 | | | | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | | 3 | 5 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Kaimakli | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 4 |
| Pallouriotissa | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | 2 |
| Anthoupolis | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Makedonitissa | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 2 | |
| Strovolos | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 6 | |
| Agiantzia | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | 3 | | | | 3 | |
| Ay.Dometios | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 4 | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Paleometoho | 5 | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | 6 | | 2 | 1 |
| Kokkinotrimithia | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 |
| Dali | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 | | 4 | 1 |
| Latsia | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | 2 |
| Lakatamia | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 3 |
| G.R.E.-Latsia | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| G.R.E.-Strovolos4 | | | 6 | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| Rural | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 19 | 22 | 21 | 25 | | 14 | 15 | 6 | 39 | 21 | 21 |
| Totals: | 21 | 20 | 34 | 28 | 22 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 19 | 25 | 22 | 21 | 25 | 22 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 39 | 21 | 21 |

Table M4. Detail table showing the distribution of marital statues per age per area studied.
(Singles include divorced and widows)

| AGE PER MARITAL STATUS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----|
| AREA | 15-19 | | | | | | | | | | 60+ |
| | MAR.SIN | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | MAR.SIN | |
| Nicosia | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | |
| Acropolis | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Egkomi | 1 | 1 | | 6 | 2 | 2 | 6 | | | | |
| Ay.Omologites | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Dasoupolis | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | 9 |
| Ay.Pavlos | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | | 2 | | | 2 |
| Kaimakli | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | 4 |
| Pallouriotissa | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 2 |
| Anthoupolis | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | 2 | | 4 |
| Makedonitissa | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | | | 4 |
| Strovolos | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Aglantzia | | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | 4 |
| Ay.Dometios | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 3 | | | 3 |
| Paleometoho | 5 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | | 3 |
| Kokkinotrimithia | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Dali | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | | 3 | | 1 |
| Latsia | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | | | | 4 |
| Lakatamia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | 3 |
| G.R.E.-Latsia | 3 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | | 1 |
| G.R.E.-Strovolos | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 |
| Rural | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 41 | 44 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 2 |
| Totals: | 2 | 39 | 27 | 32 | 43 | 41 | 44 | 25 | 4 | 45 | 15 |

Table M5. Detail table showing the distribution of place of Residency per age per area studied.

| AGE PER AREA OF RESIDENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|---|-------|----|-----|----|
| AREA | 15-19 | | 20-24 | | 25-29 | | 30-34 | | 35-39 | | 40-44 | | 45-49 | | 50-54 | | 55-59 | | 60+ | |
| | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R | U | R |
| Nicosia | 2 | | 4 | | 2 | | 5 | | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | 4 | | 1 | | | |
| Acropolis | 3 | | 5 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 2 | |
| Egkomi | 1 | | 2 | | | | 6 | | 2 | | 2 | | 6 | | | | | | 2 | |
| Ay.Omologites | | | 5 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Dasoupolis | 1 | | 6 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 3 | | 5 | | 3 | | | | 9 | |
| Ay.Pavlos | 2 | | | | 2 | | 5 | | 1 | | 8 | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| Kaimakli | | | 3 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | |
| Pallouriotissa | | | 3 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | 4 | |
| Anthoupolis | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | |
| Makedonitissa | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | | 4 | | 4 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Strovolos | 6 | | 8 | | 9 | | 2 | | 4 | | | | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | 6 | |
| Aglantzia | | | 2 | | | | 1 | | 2 | | | | 1 | | 3 | | | | 3 | |
| Ay.Dometios | 2 | | 4 | | 7 | | 4 | | 7 | | 6 | | 7 | | 3 | | | | 3 | |
| Paleometoho | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Kokkinotrimithia | | | | | 1 | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | 6 | | | |
| Dali | | 3 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | 3 | |
| Latsia | | 3 | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | 3 | | 6 | | | 3 | | 4 | |
| Lakatamia | | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 4 | |
| G.R.E.-Latsia | | 3 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | | 6 | | | | 4 | | |
| G.R.E.-Strovolos | 4 | | 7 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rural | | | | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | |
| Totals: | 25 | 16 | 50 | 12 | 28 | 13 | 29 | 9 | 29 | 15 | 29 | 14 | 29 | 18 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 36 | 24 |

Table M6: Detail table of demographic data as it was given by the department of Economics and Statistical Research.

Demography as presented by the Cypriot Department of economics and statistical research.

| VARIABLES | | % |
|------------------|--|---|
| 1.Residency | a.Urban b.Rural | 70.76% 29.24% |
| 2.Displacement | a:Refugees b:Non-Refugees | 27.6% 72.4% |
| 3.Sex | a:Males b:Females | 49.68% 50.32% |
| 4.Marital status | a:Married b:Singles | 68.9% 31.1% |
| 5.Education | a:No Schooling/Primary b:Secondary c:University | 50.4% 40.7% 9.9% |
| 6.Ages | a:15-19 b:20-24 c:25-29 d:30-34 e:35-39 f:40-44 g:45-49 h:50-54 i:55-59 j:60+ | 7.0% 9.2% 8.5% 8.1% 7.2% 6.0% 5.2% 4.7% 4.2% 13.9% |

Table M7: This table presents a comparison between research data and data given by the Department of Economics of Cyprus

| VARIABLES | | OFFICIAL DATA | RESEARCH DATA |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| 1.Residency | a:Urban b:Rural | 70.76% 29.24% | 67.0% 33.0% |
| 2.Displacement | a:Refugees b:Non-Refugees | 27.6% 72.4% | 33.5% 66.5% |
| 3.Sex | a:Males b:Females | 49.68% 50.32% | 52.0% 48.0% |
| 4.Marital status | a:Married b:Singles | 68.9% 31.1% | 68.5% 31.5% |
| 5.Education | a:No Schooling/Primary b:Secondary c:University | 50.4% 40.7% 9.9% | 43.0% 48.0% 9.0% |
| 6.Ages | a:15-19 b:20-24 c:25-29 d:30-34 e:35-39 f:40-44 g:45-49 h:50-54 i:55-59 j:60+ | 7.0% 9.2% 8.5% 8.1% 7.2% 6.0% 5.2% 4.7% 4.2% 13.9% | 7.0% 10.7% 7.0% 6.6% 7.6% 7.4% 8.1% 5.0% 4.3% 10.3% |

PART ONE

COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS OF POLICING

CHAPTER 1

ATTITUDES TO THE POLICE AND POLICING METHODS

1.1 SUMMARY

As a consequence of the high density of policemen in the country, sociologically speaking, it is possible that every family or clan will have its own policeman. This in a way assists social control i.e. crime deterrence as well as crime reporting. Furthermore, the policeman is seen as part of the family, mainly due to the fact that the police are indigenous to the culture.

As a result of the above, certain features are inevitable in society, such as:

1. More public contact with the police.
2. Presence of police in neighbourhoods is more evident.

In essence police density plays an important role in social control on account that it interacts with every single strata in the society.

1.2 SOCIAL BOND WITH THE POLICE

In general, Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 show that the majority of the population in Cyprus has a relative or a friend who is a policeman. This reflects the high density of policemen in Cyprus.

The high density of the police force in Cyprus is partly a result of the political balancing between the

police force and the Army. There is a historical significance, whereas in the past, the police force was used to keep a political balance of forces on the island. The police represented the lawful authority of independent Cyprus whereas the Army (which was then, prior to 1974, directed by the Greek junta and its liaison officers in Cyprus, part of the London-Zurich convention of 1959) had its loyalties with the Greek than the Cypriot government.

The high density of the police force in Cyprus is also the result of the demand for security against national and international predators. Large numbers of policemen man police stations along the dividing "Green Line", which divides the island into North and South as a result of the Turkish invasion. It is necessary to keep a police presence along the "Green Line" in order to deter Turkish advances and bring a feeling of security to the residents of the area. Large numbers of policemen carry out guard duties, either protecting Cypriot political personalities, or foreign embassies and missions. In addition, Cyprus is considered as a centre where international organizations conduct their business such as the UN, off-shore companies etc., which need protection against terrorists.

The relevancy to the above reference on Cypriot police is to show that although there is a high police density, much of the police force is used on miscellaneous duties. To be precise, almost 50% of the force is used for administration and security such as guard duties. This is evident by the formation of "Y.P.A." and "M.M.A.D", (special mobile units) units in the line of "S.P.G". So, although Cyprus presents a high density of policemen not all the force is deployed in the fight against crime. However, it still acts as a deterrence against crime on the merit of its high density.

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 have shown that 72.1% of the sample have a relative or a friend who is a policeman. This aids

public relations to the extent that people are more friendly towards the police. Good public relations assist in the deterrence and clearing-up of crime. England and Wales have shown a 27% clear-up rate for the year 1984, while in Cyprus the clear-up rate for the same year was around 60%.

Theoretically speaking the effect of the high acquaintance level suggests that people will come forward to report a crime. Also, the victims will be more likely to report an offence to a policeman who is his relative or friend. Logically it is expected to find less crime unreported in Cyprus. The case is not as simple as it shows; it becomes complicated further on, as I will show later on, in the thesis.

Although there are slight variations in the readings, these show no difference between the level of acquaintances between the two sexes. In general the level is very high. High acquaintance means more interaction between public and police. This affects police-public relations.

As far as ages are concerned, it seems that older people have a higher acquaintance level than younger people. There is a logical explanation in the sense that older people have formed wider social interactions. These are derived from their wider social circle and people they have met either in their professional capacity or as part of socialization or through their general social contacts.

Considering the place of residence, there is a slight difference between acquaintance and place of residence. People from urban areas have a greater acquaintance level as opposed to those from rural areas. It is relevant, that police density is greater in the towns, thus explaining why urban people have a greater police acquaintance factor. It is, therefore, justifiable to assume that (in the case of Cyprus) in the cities there is a higher police-public interaction, in comparison to rural areas.

I have found that non-refugee people in Cyprus have a greater level of police acquaintance than their compatriots who happen to be refugees. A footnote must be placed at this stage to elaborate on the term and the facts about Cypriot refugees. Since the Turkish invasion of 1974, 40% of the population were forced out of their homes in the Northern part of the island and were reallocated in the southern part of the island. The then Cypriot Government and Social Welfare Department found it necessary to house rather quickly, families facing greater hardship than others. This, in fact, divided whole families, and to some extent, whole communities were reallocated to different parts of the country. The attention is drawn to Hadjidemetriou (1983). The refugees benefited in those early settlement cases, were housed in housing estates which presented certain problems as far as social facilities were concerned.

Later on as the years passed by, the government erected modern estates abandoning the high rising flats and settling for maisonettes with ample gardens and all amenities in them, such as coffee shops, cafes, shops, etc. The phenomenon discussed here is that certain refugee housing estates present an unhealthy social environment. Besides, these housing estates are currently becoming geriatric because younger people marry and go away to build their own house. This leaves a space in the succession of generations in the estates. The only people left behind are the old and the worst off, such as low-paid workers who cannot afford to buy land and build a house of their choice.

Currently, many refugees find themselves dissatisfied with their place of residence. This is either due to economic factors or to the fact that simply the environment which was imposed upon them is not satisfactory. As a consequence many try to amend this by seeking ways to be

housed near their kin or close friends and relatives. This promotes security, socialization and conformity. The move is factual considering the great number of applications for re-housing being sent to the department dealing with the housing of refugees.

All the above have contributed rather strongly to the alienation of refugees from the police. Perhaps 'alienation' is a strong word to use; what I am insinuating is the distance from the police.

I find that there is a slight difference as far as acquaintance is concerned among people with elementary, secondary, and university education. This is relevant because it is bound by the fact that most elementary educated people come from the rural areas. As it has been pointed out in an earlier analysis, rural people have a lower acquaintance score than their urban compatriots.

The summary tables in the appendix show that there is a correlation between relationship and acquaintance of police and age, as well as the place of residence. People from rural areas with limited education know less or have fewer acquaintances with the police. This is mostly the result of less contact with the police. Later on I will discuss the reasons that initiate police contact and how acquaintance effects police contact in terms of evaluation of the said interaction.

At this point here, I must state that the less acquaintance and interaction with the police is the result of the following:

- i) Light presence of the police force.
- ii) Most police cadets are drawn from the cities.
- iii) Public hostility towards the police.
- iv) Limited interaction with the police.
- v. Displaced people (considering the fact that their social interactions have been mutated) have less acquaintance level with the police.

1.3 FREQUENCY OF POLICE'S PRESENCE WITHIN NEIGHBOURHOODS

Police's Presence in the Neighbourhood

The overwhelming majority of the population in Cyprus (note Tables 1.5, 1.6) see in their neighbourhood policemen either in their professional capacity, or as neighbours, or visitors in uniform or in civilian clothes.

"Correlational studies conducted in the USA have found that the presence of the police on the streets is associated with feeling of safety" (Balking and Houlden 1983 p.1).

Residents who have high confidence in the police are generally less fearful than those with low confidence (Baker et al 1983). Directed patrol and problem orientated policing found reduction in fear of crime (Cordner 1986). Research has also shown a relationship between the perceived adequacy of police protection and the subjective likelihood of personal victimization (Baumer 1985). Increase in patrols means a decrease of fear of crime (Pate et al 1986; Trojanowicz 1986). However, the ability to confront fear of crime through dense policing is not unanimous (Kelling et al 1974 and Tien et al 1978).

The second B.C.S (Maxfield 1987) shows that the police might have a role to play in reducing fear. However, Bennett (1991) suggests that dense policing programmes do not achieve their major goals of directly reducing the fear of crime.

"The results also showed significant improvements in satisfaction with the areas, sense of community and control of crime in at least one of the areas" (Bennett 1991 p.12).

The research results speak for themselves. Only a fraction of the population have pointed out that they do

not find any police presence in their neighbourhoods. Again, this is justified by the fact that there is a large police density in the country.

The great majority of people both in urban and rural areas see policemen more frequently in their neighbourhoods. It is somewhat strange to find a large figure of urban residents who do not see any policemen in their neighbourhoods, because this challenges the density argument which suggests that the high density of the police force in the country will lead to a high frequency of police's presence in villages, townships, suburbs and indeed neighbourhoods.

A detailed analysis will show that 44 people out of 71 urban residents who have indicated that they do not see any police in their neighbourhood happen to have secondary education. This variable is the only common element or rather the most possible correlation in explaining such feature.

One good reason is that secondary-educated people are mostly out their homes during the day, at work which prevents them from keeping an eye on police presence in their neighbourhood.

Elementary-educated people are mostly old people as far as the demographic data is concerned. Usually, they stay at home on account of being retired and inductively they have a better chance to keep an eye on police movements in their neighbourhood.

It seems that police presence is equally evident and at the same rate both in urban and rural areas of Cyprus. Only the group of secondary-educated respondents have indicated that they do not observe any police presence in their neighbourhood. This suggests that there is some kind of vulnerability in this social group on account of not being aware of police presence in their neighbourhood. This leads to insecurity and up to a certain extent to,

hostility on the part of urban secondary educated people towards the police. Later on in the thesis, I will try to explain this phenomenon once I have compared all other questions and variables (Reference on the topic of fear of crime in Cyprus see chapter 6 and 7). I aim to find what social groups among the general population feel more secure in society. Also whether police presence in their neighbourhood can give an indication for the assumed fear of crime (see chapter 7).

Satisfaction of Police Work in the Neighbourhoods.

The main theme of the following tables is that younger people are more dissatisfied with police work in their neighbourhood in comparison to older people. It is evident (note Tables 1.7, 1.8) that although there is a great satisfaction proportion among the three age groups, there is a reciprocate dissatisfaction proportion among the age groups. Older people are more satisfied. The age group 30-44 comes somewhere in the middle of the two other age groups.

All three academic groups indicated a high percentage of satisfaction, with a reciprocate relation as far as dissatisfaction is concerned. Elementary educated people are more satisfied than secondary and university educated, while university and secondary are more dissatisfied than elementary educated subjects.

It is shown on Table 1.9 that the major cause of dissatisfaction has to do with "no patrols by police force in the neighbourhood". A second cause deals with "police inadequacy in policing". The third cause is that of "no police interest in their work". Finally, a fourth cause relates to "favouritism". All the above reasons refer directly to police response and behaviour. The majority of the dissatisfied respondents pointed out that this was due to police work and behaviour. The remaining of the

respondents gave other reasons as the cause of their dissatisfaction i.e. disturbances, dense traffic, and a fraction of the dissatisfied respondents did not respond.

One other major observation to Table 1.9 is that the urban respondents are more dissatisfied than rural respondents and younger respondents are more dissatisfied than older ones. The above results are parallel to and bear some kind of correlation with Tables 1.7, 1.8.

1.4 FREQUENCY OF PUBLIC CONTACT AND REASONS FOR THE ASSOCIATION WITH THE POLICE.

Frequency of Public Contact and Association with the Police.

An analysis of Tables 1.10, 1.11 suggest that the general public presents the following frequency of contact with the police:

I. 3.0% of the population contacted the police in less than a week.

II. 2.1% of the population contacted the police in less than a month.

III 4.6% of the population contacted the police between 1-3 months.

IV. 5.6% of the population contacted the police between 3-6 months.

V. 6.3% of the population contacted the police between 6-12 months.

VI. 20.7% of the population contacted the police in more than 1 year.

VII. 56.5% of the population has never contacted the police in whatever capacity.

VIII. 1.2% of the population refused to answer.

Before making any inferences, I should point out that several respondents were police officers and professional

people who had a daily contact with the police. This is so, on account of the police high density in the country.

It is clear that the males have a slight advantage in comparison to the females, as far as police contact is concerned. At this stage of my thesis, the main issue in question is the frequency of police contact and not the issue of criminality. It has to be made clear that the figures above refer to contact in general terms, i.e. for information, for inquiries, illegal parking, to pay a fine, traffic offence, etc. The tables that follow will present the reasons that led to the contact with the police.

The above figures should come as no surprise. Males are more energetic in society, car drivers are in general males and in essence the males have more contact with the police, socially and professionally. Females mostly communicated less with the police. This result is up to the expectation.

It is clear that the younger people have greater communication with the police as opposed to the older people in society. Attention is drawn to the point where it states that respondents never had any contact with the police. Older people (i.e. over 45 years of age at a rate of 64%) never had any contact with the police. This does not conflict with the result from question 1 of the questionnaire that stated that older people have a greater acquaintance level than the younger ones. It is possible that older people might relate to policemen in social terms and not in a professional capacity as inquired in question 3 of the questionnaire.

The above tables suggest that among the population of Cyprus rural people per ratio have less contact with the police. What is interesting to observe is again the "no Police contact". Rural population have more "no contact" as opposed to that of urban population. Both Punch and Naylor (1973) and Jones (1983) noted a lower proportion of

crime related contacts among rural than among urban responses. Definitely the urban population bothers the police a great deal more than their rural compatriots. I shall answer the reason "why" later on, when I analyze the question referring to the reasons of contact.

In summary, the above tables infer that the very young urban citizens of Cyprus have greater police contact than any other social group in the country.

Although there is a slight discrepancy in the difference of the rows of data as far as time of contact with the police is concerned, it is absolutely clear that refugees bother the police more in comparison with non-refugees. In essence, what I am saying is that among the refugee population a high percentage of them have contacted the police for one reason or another while the non-refugee population has a smaller proportion. An earlier study by myself (Hadjidemetriou, 1986), has inferred that refugees from housing estates are rated higher on crime reporting in comparison to non-refugees. The above study was conducted in 1984 and S.E.R. (Social Enquiry Reports) were studied, for years 1981 to 1984. The common finding was that refugees were disproportionally accused of physical violence in comparison with non-refugees.

As far as the three academic groups are concerned I observe that university graduates have more contact with the police followed by people with secondary education. It is my opinion that due to the fact that the total of university graduates is less than 40 which is the minimum figure per cell (factor), results must be perceived with certain scepticism. It does not necessarily mean that university graduates have more contact with the police in comparison with other academic groups.

So far, I can draw certain conclusions from answers of question 3 of the questionnaire:

- a) male residents have more contact with the police

- b) 15-29 age group has more contact with the police
- c) Urban residents have more contact with the police
- d) Refugees have more contact with the police
- e) University-educated residents have more contact with the police.

Reasons of Contact and Association with the Police

Tables 1.12 and 1.13 include police contact within last year and during an undefined period. It is evident that the majority of the people who contacted the police or rather preoccupied the police, are involved with offences related to traffic offences (accidents, traffic offences, payment of fine). Various authors explain the break or adhere to the rules of the road. The potential offender, it is assumed, weighs up the opportunities, cost and benefits of offending and the decision making is said to be rational (Cornish and Clarke 1986). The rational choice model has also been applied to a range of different offences including robbery (Walsh 1986); shoplifting (Carroll and Weaver 1986) and drug addiction (Bennett 1986a). The above theory can easily be applied to the Cypriot setting. Because there is not much deterrence as far as traffic offences are concerned due to the fact that: a) traffic laws constitute a formal social order which Cypriots somehow find it hard to come to terms with, b) because of the high police density and the high acquaintance level, Cypriots believe that it is possible to come to terms with the police and negotiate the offence. The Rational choice theory was also adopted by Hirshi (1986); Cornish and Clarken (1989); offenders' cutting corners by Carroll (1978); Bennett and Wright (1984); limited rationality by Simon (1957).

"Drivers do have needs which can be served by various forms of traffic offending. They do weigh up the opportunities, cost and benefits of offending, albeit largely with limited rationality" (Corbett and Simon 1992 p.547).

It must be noted that the figures from the above tables, are in general terms, and include automobile and motorcycle accidents as well as serious and not serious offences. Property offences follow second. The third reason refers to the report or statement i.e. general reporting. Some of the respondents were policemen, lawyers as well as civil servants who pointed out that they had a daily contact with the police as part of their profession. This might have altered slightly the readings, by increasing the numbers (disproportional) in favour of frequent contact with the public. In the fifth place come inquiries. In the sixth place come statements. Then follow offences against the person and then summons. In the ninth place come sexual offences.

Table 1.15 is in more detail but this should not be seen as presenting any form of ambiguity to the above results. As far as age groups are concerned, the age group 15-29 years old come first with police contact; then the age group 30-45 years old. As far as the sex variable is concerned, males preoccupy the police more than females. Indeed this is the general expectation. Due to the fact that the numbers are very small any cross-section analysis will not carry any formal validity.

Finally I have to mention that 13.3% of the respondents did not give an answer about last year's contact and 14.7% of the respondents did not give an answer about the previous years contact.

Level of Satisfaction as a Result of Contact
and Association with the Police.

It is evident from Tables 1.14, 1.15 that the overwhelming majority of the respondents have indicated that they were satisfied with the police's contact. This contradicts findings from England and Wales which show that satisfaction among victims of crime (with the way in which the police handled their case) has declined during the period 1982 to 1988 (Mayhew et al 1989). Also the proportion of the population rating police performance as "good" or "very good" fell over the period of the last three surveys (Skogan 1990). Also Box et al (1988) showed a direct relationship between public confidence in the police and fear of crime.

As far as the sex variable is concerned I do not detect any major difference. However, there is a slight increase in the satisfaction levels of females. Due to the fact that the numbers are very small I cannot make any real case or make a hypothesis that males are slightly dissatisfied with the police's contact in comparison to females.

It is clear that the younger people are quite dissatisfied with the police's contact in comparison with the other age groups.

Similarly Dobash et al (1990) support the arguments that young people and other members of the public object to the way the police conduct themselves in contacts with the public. Additionally Schumann and Kaulitzki (1988):

"Police contact does not bring about a reduction in deviancy: rather, there is no strong relationship between these two variables refuting the conception of individual deterrence..... Whether young people encountered the police as victims, witnesses, or suspects, contacts have a negative effect on their orientations towards the police"
(Schumann and Kaulitzki 1988 p.317).

Research reports from several countries indicate that the young and members of ethnic minorities, especially the young, report negative contacts and orientation towards the police (Shaw and Williamson 1972; Smith 1975; Tisseyre 1976; Garofalo 1977; Rusinko, Johnson and Hornung 1978; Robert 1978; Scaglio and Condon 1980; Smith and Cray 1983). Young people in Scotland (Dobash, Dobash and Ballintyre 1987), Young people in London (Smith and Cray 1983).

Results from this study will verify the above concerning the attitude of the young towards the police.

Overwhelmingly the older people age 45-60 seem to be satisfied with police's contact. In the age group 30-44 only 16% seem to be dissatisfied, but this figure should not be representative because these numbers are small and create great variations in terms of percentages. Note that only 4 people out of 25 of this particular age group have indicated a dissatisfaction.

The majority of the urban and rural people who had any contact with the police seem to be overwhelmingly satisfied with the police's response.

Refugees and non-refugees follow the same trend of response. The majority of refugees and non-refugees have shown a positive response to question number 4 of the questionnaire i.e. both social groups seem to be quite satisfied. Among the non-refugee group it is evident that there is a small level of dissatisfaction. This is a point I will expand later on.

Comparing the three academic levels it is shown that all groups present a high proportion of satisfaction in their contact with the police. It is evident that all three education levels are somewhat cohesive in their reading. The elementary-educated seem to be very satisfied while the university-educated seem to be just satisfied. Secondary-educated persons come in the middle. Elementary-educated respondents did not show any form of

dissatisfaction whatsoever.

1.5 DISCUSSION

In this part of the thesis I have established the relationship between the public and the police, as well as the frequency of police contact and the reason why.

Overwhelmingly, the Cypriots, as it was shown from this survey, have a high police acquaintance level which is mainly based on kinship. The main features here show that older people as well as urban residents have higher levels of acquaintance.

It is necessary to place a caution as far as the responses made by older and lower-educated responses. According to de Vaus (1991) the above demographic stratas show greater no-response rates in the completion of questionnaires. The above effects influence the general response ratio. For this reasons I place a note of caution i.e to treat responses made by old and low-educated respondents with skepticism. The effect of no-response will be more evident in the following sections and chapters.

It is important to note that these are two social groups which are more vulnerable to victimization. It is also speculated that because of the high level of acquaintance with the police, it gives the above groups some kind of protection from victimization on account that the police act as a deterrent agent because they are so close to these social groups.

Furthermore, it is shown that the police presence in the neighbourhoods is much evident. It is clearly crucial that the police forces and the police officers should be fully aware of the "demand structure" in their own areas (Kelling et al 1980). Only a small fraction of the respondents indicated that they do not see any policemen in their neighbourhood. This is so in anticipation to the high density of the police in the country.

Unlike England and Wales, where the police density is less, (Smith 1983) Smith and Cray (1985) show that home beat officers comprise 5% of all officers up to the rank of inspector; West Midlands Police (1983) show 9% while Trevor Bennett and Ruth Lumpton (1992) show 19% share in provisional forces and 13% for metropolitan police. Because Westernized societies do not have the proper social mix with the police (i.e. kinship, social norms, or moral code), they rely on artificial means of public-police interaction. Following the Scarman (1986) report in England and Wales, emphasis was given on community orientated approaches such as: Creation of Liaison Officers (Phillips and Cochrane 1988), Introduction of community Consultatives (Morgan 1986), Community Orientated Strategies (Weatheritt 1986). However, there is opposition and skepticism to the above measures by uniformed police (Alderson 1979; Goldstein 1990). It is therefore true to say that police interaction with the public is the essence of policing and social order in contemporary society.

Some respondents indicated that their dissatisfaction is based on the opinion that there are no "sufficient police patrols" as well as "inadequate policing".

The majority of the dissatisfied respondents are urban youngsters. The Young tend to be less favourable in their attitudes and more dissatisfied with the contacts they have (Tuck and Southgate 1981; Jones 1983; P.S.I 1983).

As far as the police contact is concerned 56.5% of all respondents have never approached the police. The majority of the no contact respondents are old people, females and rural residents. The relevant data shows that 43.8% of all police contact relates to traffic offences, while 13.3% relate to crime related cases. The remaining 29.6% relate to miscellaneous cases. This is a significant result when compared with similar findings from Maclean et al (1986) (see Table 1.16, page 98).

There are two theories to the issue of deterrence as a result of police contact. One theory suggests that police contact will deter offenders. Reaction arguments suggest that contact with police will not only fail to deter subsequent deviance but, by increasing exposure to deviant subcultures it may actually amplify the likelihood of its recurrence (Wilking 1967). Control theory basically posits that society has norms and values, that are generally shared by its members, and that, if individuals transgress, deterrence is a matter of application of the said norms and values (Hirschi 1969). In contrast to Durkheims' moral control aspect, current socialization and control start with the family and as children grow older and autonomous, familiar influence decreases and formal mechanisms of control in the wider community such as churches, schools and the police, become more salient (Hagan, Simpson and Gills 1979; Agnew 1984; Linden and Fillmore 1981; Segrare and Hastad 1985; Eliot Huizinga and Ageton 1985).

Females in general, whether in Britain or Cyprus, are more often the objects of informal than formal social control; this is on account of social pressure from male domination as well as ascribed social norms. There is more risk aversion and they are less inclined to engage in deviant behaviour than males are. This suggests that females may be more susceptible to deterrence than males are, who are more likely to take risks including deviant behaviour and are more often in contact with the police (Hagan et al 1979, 1985, 1987). Among males, differential association is a better predictor of delinquency than control theory is (Matsveda and Heimer 1987). This suggests that contact with the police is more likely to amplify the deviant behaviour of males than females. The Deterrence theory may hold for females, who are more risk-averse, while amplification arguments may be more credible for males who are more risk-oriented and likely to

see a brush with the police as a challenge (Keane et al 1989). Because of this challenge, later results will show that the Cypriot Youth challenges the authority of the police. In addition, they question the effectiveness of the police.

Table 1.16 Reasons for police contact in Cyprus & Islington.

| | Islington Crime Survey | Cyprus Crime Survey |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| A. Crime Related | 50.8 | 13.3 |
| B. Public Order Related | 5.6 | |
| C. Service Related | 40.8 | 73.4 |
| D. Social | 3.0 | |
| E. N/A | -- | 13.3 |

Although cases and computations are not quite uniform in the above table (between the two studies), at least they give an indication as to the extent of police contact. Clifford (1954a) has already shown that criminality in Cyprus is very low indeed when seen from a traditional perspective. More recently in "Crime and Punishment in Cyprus, England and Wales 1983", I have shown that Cyprus has one tenth of the amount of crime reported in England and Wales. It is, therefore, inevitable that the Cypriots will contact the police in matters other than criminal (note Table 1.16). More specifically it is shown that the public preoccupies the police with traffic offences. An increase in the number of cars within the last decade coupled with a limited drive space, inevitably led to traffic offences.

The Cypriot police contact ratio contradicts that of England and Wales. For instance, Ekblom and Head (1982) found that, of all calls received at one sub-division only

3/10ths were crime related. Punch and Naylon (1973) found only 41% of requests for help related to law enforcement. Comrie and Kings (1975) found 34% of calls were concerned with crime. Hough (1980) found 36% of incidents attended by patrols involved crime. Jones (1983) found 43% of contacts made by the public were crime related. Southgate and Ekblom (1984) found 4% contact as victims of crime and 10% as contact of victim and non-victim.

Futhermore, Southgate and Ekblom (1984) show that contact with the police with reference to traffic offences counts only for 4%, while in Cyprus it amounts to 40%. It is interesting to note that 57% of the British sample had no contact, an equal amount 56.5% of the Cyprus sample.

It is, therefore true to say that the Cypriot police are preoccupied mostly with no serious crime-orientated activity. Under normal circumstances, this has a serious effect on policing, in the sense that it wastes man-power. However, due to the fact that society has its own defence mechanisms as far as crime control is concerned, it can do without police assistance.

However, I believe that this preoccupation of the police with no serious crime orientated activity, will lead to a transformation of police roles. Instead of taking up the right place in the society as a policing agent it will be viewed as a "traffic warden" and it will lose all those positive attitudes expressed by the public.

As a result of the above contact, 73.1% of those that contacted the police claimed satisfaction. It seems that the females, older people and rural population are more satisfied than other social groups. The above results are cohesive and similar to those of Painter et al (1989) and Crawford et al (1990).

The main theme here is that, although the residents of Islington, Hammersmith and Fulham as well as Cyprus show the same degree of satisfaction with police contact, the

seriousness of the cases in England and Wales are more evident than those in Cyprus.

I was expecting to find more dissatisfaction in England and Wales (Skogan 1990; Mayhew et al 1989) because the seriousness of the cases involved in police contact would have acted negatively on the people's attitudes towards the police, (considering the low clear-up rate that exists in the country). Sociologically speaking, if one accepts that the British society relies on the police to solve all social problems because the social structure is inadequate (to control crime) then one accepts that satisfaction develops on account that the public views and accepts the police as the law enforcer and administrator of justice in society.

On the other hand, in Cyprus, the people might have expressed satisfaction with police contact, merely because their cases are not serious enough to cause them personal concern. Some studies among victims have suggested greater satisfaction among those with problems the police are most willingly able to act upon, i.e. serious crimes rather than trivial ones (Poister and McDavid 1978) or property offences rather than other problems (Ekblom and Heal 1982). Those stopped by the police were rather more critical (Rusinko et al 1978; Mori 1980; N.O.P. 1981; P.S.I. 1983; Belson 1975). Ekblom and Heal (1982) have suggested that many people are genuinely ignorant of how good or bad a job the police do and how well-versed they are with local problems.

In Cyprus, society is able to absorb and deal with any crime-orientated behaviour. But what would happen when the social structure starts to disintegrate and all those social chains do not exist any more to deter crime? The police will inevitably have to step in equipped with its notably changed role, as described above. As soon as it is called to take action, I am afraid it will be met with

dissatisfaction from the public, because the police behaviour will be strange and novel to the society.

Therefore, I assume that maintaining this social disintegration, the people of Cyprus will be more dissatisfied with police contact, not because criminality is increasing but because of the steps the police will have to take in order to combat crime adequately.

Further to the above chapter, I will also attempt to present satisfaction with police performance as well as images of the police. These topics will give sufficient ground to define the position of the police in the society, as well as the public attitude towards policing methods.

Tables of Chapter One

Table 1.1 Having a friend or acquaintance who is a policeman, Absolute numbers.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.R.E. | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 310 | 160 | 150 | 131 | 151 | 28 | 95 | 215 | 212 | 98 | 99 | 93 | 118 |
| NO | 117 | 63 | 54 | 54 | 53 | 10 | 47 | 70 | 74 | 43 | 43 | 32 | 42 |
| DIK | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | - | 1 |

Table 1.2 Having a friend or acquaintance who is a police man. Percentages.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| YES | 72.1 | 71.4 | 72.8 | 70.8 | 73.3 | 71.8 | 66.0 | 75.2 | 73.4 | 69.5 | 68.7 | 74.4 | 73.3 |
| NO | 27.2 | 28.1 | 26.2 | 29.2 | 25.7 | 25.6 | 32.6 | 24.5 | 25.6 | 30.5 | 29.9 | 25.6 | 26.0 |
| DIK | .7 | .5 | .2 | - | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.4 | .3 | 1.0 | - | 1.4 | - | .7 |

Table 1.3 Calling a policeman by name. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N. REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 117 | 63 | 54 | 54 | 53 | 10 | 47 | 70 | 74 | 43 | 43 | 32 | 42 |
| YES | 12 | 9 | 3 | - | 11 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| NO | 100 | 53 | 47 | 54 | 38 | 8 | 41 | 59 | 60 | 40 | 36 | 30 | 34 |
| DIK | 5 | 1 | 4 | - | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | - | - |

Table 1.4 Calling a policeman by name, Percentages

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 10.3 | 14.3 | 5.5 | - | 20.7 | 20.0 | 6.4 | 14.3 | 14.9 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 6.2 | 19.0 |
| NO | 85.5 | 84.1 | 87.1 | 100 | 71.7 | 80.0 | 87.2 | 84.3 | 80.0 | 93.0 | 83.7 | 93.8 | 81.0 |
| DIK | 4.2 | 1.6 | 7.4 | - | 7.6 | - | 6.4 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 9.3 | - | - |

Table 1.5 Presence of policeman in neighbourhood. Absolute numbers

| | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> |
| <u>TOTAL</u> | | |
| Base | 289 | 141 |
| 1. Every day | 115 | 56 |
| 2. Once a Week | 25 | 23 |
| 3. Rarely | 66 | 43 |
| 4. Never | 71 | 18 |
| 5. No Answer | 12 | 1 |

Table 1.6 Presence of policeman in neighbourhood. Percentages.

| | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> |
| Base | 100 | 100 |
| 1.Every day | 39.8 | 39.7 |
| 2.Once a Week | 8.7 | 16.3 |
| 3.Rarely | 22.8 | 30.5 |
| 4.Never | 24.6 | 12.8 |
| 5.No Answer | 4.1 | 0.7 |

Table 1.7

Satisfaction of people from the application of law and order by the police in neighbourhood.
Absolute number.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 430 | | | 185 | 206 | 39 | | | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 339 | | | 166 | 148 | 25 | | | 214 | 125 | 97 | 101 | 141 |
| NO | 70 | | | 17 | 43 | 10 | | | 54 | 16 | 37 | 18 | 15 |
| DIK | 21 | | | 2 | 15 | 4 | | | 21 | - | 10 | 6 | 5 |

Table 1.8 Satisfaction of people from the application of law and order by the police in neighbourhood.
Percentages

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 78.8 | | | 89.7 | 71.8 | 64.1 | | | 74.0 | 88.7 | 67.4 | 80.8 | 87.6 |
| NO | 16.3 | | | 9.2 | 20.9 | 25.6 | | | 18.7 | 11.3 | 25.7 | 14.4 | 9.3 |
| DIK | 4.9 | | | 1.1 | 7.3 | 10.3 | | | 7.3 | - | 6.9 | 4.8 | 3.1 |

Table 1.9 Reasons why respondents are not satisfied with police work in their neighbourhoods.

| BASE | 15-19 U (37) | 30-44 U (18) | 45-60 U (15) | TOTAL (70) | % |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|------|
| 1. Disturbances | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 10.8 |
| 2. No Patrols | 8 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 23 |
| 3. Dense Traffic | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 9.5 |
| 4. No Interest by Police | 4 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 12.2 |
| 5. Favouritism | 4 | | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| 6. Inadequate Policing | 5 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 14.9 |
| 7. No Response | 2 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 21.6 |
| TOTAL | 30 | 9 | 14 | 74 | 100 |

Table 1.10 The last time the respondents contacted the police. Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>T.L.</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMAL</u> | <u>ELEM</u> | <u>SECON</u> | <u>UNIVE</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| Base | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| 1.Less than a Week | 13 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| 2.Less than a month | 9 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 3.Between 1-3 months | 20 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 16 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 2 |
| 4.Between 3-6 months | 24 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 10 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 |
| 5.Between 6 months-1year | 27 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 7 | 20 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 6.more than a year | 89 | 46 | 43 | 25 | 49 | 15 | 31 | 58 | 66 | 23 | 33 | 25 | 31 |
| 7.Never had any contact | 243 | 119 | 124 | 138 | 97 | 8 | 73 | 170 | 150 | 93 | 68 | 72 | 103 |
| 8.No Answer | 5 | 3 | 2 | - | 5 | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

Table 1.11 The last time the respondents contacted the police. Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>T.L.</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMAL</u> | <u>ELEM</u> | <u>SECON</u> | <u>UNIVE</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| Base | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1.Less than a week | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 10.2 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| 2.Less than a month | 2.1 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.5 |
| 3.Between 1-3 months | 4.6 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 10.2 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 5.5 | 2.8 | 9.8 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
| 4.Between 3-6 months | 5.6 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 3.5 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| 5.Between 6 months-1year | 6.3 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 3.8 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 4.8 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 5.6 |
| 6.more than a year | 20.7 | 20.5 | 20.9 | 13.5 | 23.8 | 38.5 | 21.5 | 20.3 | 22.8 | 16.3 | 23.0 | 20.0 | 19.2 |
| 7.Never had a conduct | 56.5 | 53.1 | 60.2 | 74.6 | 47.0 | 20.6 | 50.7 | 59.4 | 52.0 | 66.0 | 47.0 | 57.6 | 64.0 |
| 8.NO Answer | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | - | 2.4 | - | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.6 |

Table 1.12 Reasons of contact with the police within the last
year.

| BASE | 15-29 M F (41) | 30-44 M F (26) | 45-60 M F (26) | TOTAL (93) | % |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|------|
| 1. TRAFFIC OFFENCES | | | | | |
| a: Accident | 4 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 17.3 |
| b: Traffic laws | 9 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 21.4 |
| c: Pay Fine | 2 | 1 | | 5 | 5.1 |
| 2. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | |
| a: Theft | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6.1 |
| b: Damage | | | 1 | 1 | 1.1 |
| c: Burglary | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 3.0 |
| 3. SEXUAL | | | | | |
| a: Sexual | 1 | | | 1 | 1.1 |
| 4. AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | |
| a: Bodily Harm | | | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| 5. OTHER | | | | | |
| a: Report | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 9.2 |
| b: Statement | 2 | | 1 | 4 | 4.1 |
| c: Enquiries | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6.1 |
| d: Professionally | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7.1 |
| e: Summons | | 2 | | 2 | 2.0 |
| g: Arrests | 1 | | | 1 | 1.1 |
| 6. NO ANSWER | 4 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 13.3 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 16 | 21 | 98 | 100 |

Table 1.13 Reasons of contact irrelevant of period of time
including more than a year of occurrence.

| BASE | 15-29 | | 30-44 | | 45-60 | | TOTAL | % |
|-----------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | | |
| | (33) | (25) | (31) | (89) | | | | |
| 1. TRAFFIC OFFENCES | | | | | | | | |
| a: Accident | 9 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 39 | 19.8 |
| b: Traffic laws | 12 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | 29 | 14.7 |
| c: Pay Fine | 3 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 11 | 5.6 |
| d: Illegal Parking | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 |
| 2. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | |
| a: Theft | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 18 | 9.1 |
| b: Damage | | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1.0 |
| c: Burglary | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | 6 | 3.1 |
| d: Car Theft | 4 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 2.5 |
| 3. SEXUAL | | | | | | | | |
| a: Sexual | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | 4 | 2.0 |
| 4. AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | |
| a: Bodily Harm | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 | 1.0 |
| 5. OTHER | | | | | | | | |
| a: Report | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 10.7 |
| b: Statement | 1 | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3.6 |
| c: Enquiries | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 4 | | 9 | 4.6 |
| d: Professionally | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | 6 | 3.1 |
| e: Summons | 1 | | 2 | | | | 3 | 1.5 |
| f: Politics | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 |
| g: Arrests | 3 | | | 1 | | | 4 | 2.0 |
| 6. NO ANSWER | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 29 | 14.7 |
| TOTAL | 48 | 26 | 24 | 28 | 40 | 31 | 197 | |

Table 1.14 Level of satisfaction out of police contact within the last year. Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMAL</u> | <u>ELEME</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| Base | 93 | 57 | 36 | 23 | 53 | 17 | 37 | 56 | 69 | 24 | 42 | 25 | 26 |
| a.Yes-Very | 21 | 16 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 11 |
| b.Yes | 47 | 22 | 25 | 9 | 24 | 14 | 20 | 27 | 33 | 14 | 19 | 14 | 14 |
| c.Indifferent | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | - | 3 | 2 | 5 | - | 4 | 1 | - |
| d.No | 11 | 9 | 2 | - | 9 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| e.Very | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disappointed | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | 4 | - | 4 | - | - |
| f.No Answer | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | - | - |

Table 1.15 Level of Satisfaction out of police contact within the last year. Percentages.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMAL</u> | <u>ELEME</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N, REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| Base | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| a. Yes-Very | 22.6 | 28.0 | 14.0 | 43.5 | 18.9 | 5.9 | 21.6 | 23.2 | 21.7 | 25.0 | 9.5 | 24.0 | 42.3 |
| b. Yes | 50.5 | 38.6 | 69.4 | 39.1 | 45.3 | 82.4 | 54.1 | 48.2 | 47.8 | 58.3 | 45.2 | 56.0 | 53.8 |
| c. Indifferent | 5.4 | 7.0 | 2.8 | 4.3 | 7.5 | - | 8.1 | 3.6 | 7.3 | - | 9.5 | 4.0 | - |
| d. No | 11.8 | 15.8 | 5.5 | - | 17.0 | 11.7 | 5.4 | 16.1 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 14.3 | 16.0 | 3.9 |
| e. Very | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disappointed | 4.3 | 5.3 | 2.8 | - | 7.5 | - | 2.7 | 5.3 | 5.8 | - | 9.5 | - | - |
| f. No Answer | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 13.1 | 3.8 | - | 8.1 | 3.6 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 12.0 | - | - |

CHAPTER 2

POLICE PERFORMANCE

2.1 SUMMARY

In this chapter I will present the results of the public-police interaction. Although it has been shown in the previous chapter that the police enjoy the confidence of the public in general, I will now investigate police performance as far as satisfaction is concerned with reference to police work, response to an emergency, the degree of efficiency, as well as the level of police fairness.

Results will show that, indeed, contrary to foreign experience with policing matters, the Cypriot police are viewed positively. The reason coincide with the positive perception the police receive from the public. This conclusion evolves from the fact that the effort of the Cypriot police is mainly directed towards combating non-serious crime. This allows the social mechanism to solve the issue of crime. Negativism and dissatisfaction do exist and they are factors of cultural prejudice and traditional defiance to authority rather than dissatisfaction through inability of the police to cope with crime.

2.2 SCALING POLICE PERFORMANCE

The majority of the people that took part in the survey have indicated that they consider the police's work "good" - note Tables 2.1, 2.2. This was followed by those who indicated that they consider the police's work as "ordinary" or "medium". A further percentage indicated that the police's work is "very good" and finally only a small percentage of them indicated that the police's work is

"poor". A small portion did not answer the question.

As far as the differences in the sexes are concerned there are no major differences in the rating of perception of performance. There is a slight difference as far as the "fair" rating is concerned. More females than males have considered police performance as "fair".

Older respondents indicated overwhelmingly a "very good" performance. Younger respondents indicated dissatisfaction i.e. "poor" performance in comparison with older respondents. The essence of these tables is that older people are quite satisfied with the police's work done in the society in general. This was the same theme of analysis found in Tables 1.7, 1.8 about the police's performance in enforcement of law and order in their neighbourhood. In addition, the other similarity with Tables 1.7, 1.8 is that younger people indicated a dissatisfaction with the police's work done in their neighbourhood in enforcing law and order. In essence there is some form of correlation between satisfaction of the public, per age group and police's performance.

The above tables also show a form of correlation between urban and rural people's response on police's performance in general. Both groups of people indicated a high proportion for "good" performance. Rural people have rated police performance greater on "very good" and "good" while urban people rated the police's performance as "fair" and "poorly". It seems that urban people are not all that satisfied with the police's work in general. Urban population indicated generally a "poorly" performance while only 1.4% of the rural population indicated a "poorly" performance. People from towns and suburbs seem to have a negative perception of police behaviour. Because they experience more police action they are in a position to be more critical. Later on I will make an analysis concerning fear of crime through experience and through suggestibility

(influence of the media Note chapter 7).

Both refugees and non-refugees rated police performance in general rather high as "good" and "very good" respectively. The above results bear some similarity with results from Tables 1.7, 1.8. A tiny minority of non-refugees have rated police performance "very poor". What I am suggesting, is that, whatever hostility or negative perception of the police's work and performance (as noted) evolves from the sector of non-refugees.

All three academic groups indicated a high percentage of "good" performance by the police. The dissatisfied ones are among secondary and university-educated respondents. A high proportion of secondary-educated respondents indicated that the police's performance in general is rated as "fair".

Overall the police's performance is perceived as "good" inclining towards "fair".

2.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE OF POLICE WORK

Before expanding on Table 2.3 it is necessary to point out that not all subjects responded to the following issue. In addition, I must point out that it was only the minority of dissatisfied respondents that have registered a suggestion as to how the police will improve itself. The overwhelming majority of respondents who answered "very good" and "good" found the police's work as satisfying. Therefore, the above table refers to the minority of dissatisfied respondents, (defined police performance "poor") which account for 24.9% of the sample.

Dissatisfied subjects suggested that more patrols will improve the police's work, while others said that the police should show more interest in their work. Another percentage said that the police need to improve education in the police force and another fraction said that the

police should show more discipline. Others said that the police need to show more strictness with offenders. Additionally others said that the police should stop favouritism in their dealings. This means that the police should not use double standards, and should maintain equality among the residents. Another proportion said that the police should only concern themselves to law and order issues and stop any other activities. In Cyprus, it is widely believed that the police officers are spending their off-work time in personal businesses; thus, not giving the appropriate attention to their work as police officers. Only 12.3% of the respondents indicated that the police force needs reinforcement with manpower. This questions recent moves by the Cypriot Chief of Police who has asked from the government to employ another 500 special police officers to overcome manpower shortages in order to be able to enforce law and order.

Subjects gave other suggestions for police improvement which are rated with less than 8%. There are: Improve police behaviour, improve traffic, improve police organization, more police powers, public assistance to the police, more police stations and police officers to be more active.

2.4 RESPONSE OF THE POLICE TO AN EMERGENCY SITUATION

Respondents stated overwhelmingly that the police will respond immediately to an emergency situation (note Tables 2.4, 2.5).

The majority of the respondents indicated that the police will respond immediately. The majority of male and female respondents said that the police will respond immediately in a case of emergency.

All three age groups rated very highly the likelihood of police responding immediately in a case of emergency. However, there is a considerable difference in the number

of responses which lead one to believe, that among younger respondents there is less trust as far as the police's response is concerned. This is endorsed by the fact that a high percentage of all 15-29 year olds believe that the police will not respond to an emergency. This result correlates with previous findings that indicate that the young people are not satisfied with the police's work done in their neighbourhood.

Both urban and rural respondents rated "very high" the police's response to an emergency. In proportion, more rural respondents indicated that the police will respond immediately to an emergency in comparison with urban residents. There is a paradox here; although police are denser in the cities, people feel that they will not respond to an emergency. It is equally interesting to note that a large proportion of the urban respondents did not register an answer.

Both refugees and non-refugees gave high percentages on the police's response in an emergency. However, non-refugees gave a much higher percentage than refugees.

There is a high proportion of secondary and university-educated respondents who are sceptical about the police's immediate response in an emergency. All academic groups of respondents registered a high percentage of "yes". It is noticeable that elementary-educated respondents have the highest percentages. Among the secondary-educated respondents, 25.2% of them said that the police will not respond immediately in an emergency. This is the highest "no" response among all three academic groups. It is noticeable that a large proportion of all elementary-educated respondents did not respond at all to the question i.e. gave no answer (de Vaus 1991).

2.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE POLICE IMAGE

Perception of the Police by the Public as far as Equal Treatment is Concerned.

It seems that the overwhelming majority of the respondents have indicated that the police are fair, and do not make any discrimination in their deals (Note Tables 2.6, 2.7). The figure is very high 79.1% in comparison with 15.1% of the respondents who have an opposite opinion.

Both sexes rated "very high" police's credibility. A large percentage of females indicated the opposite. This is rather novel because I find for the first time that females have a different opinion concerning evaluation of police behaviour. Earlier on, it was stated that it is the males who are more suspicious of the police's behaviour.

In the younger age group there is a considerable proportion who believe that the police are not credible in their dealings. When comparing all three age groups, I find indeed all age groups gave a high credibility percentage. Older age groups have a greater percentage of credibility while younger people have pointed a "no credibility" evaluation.

There is no major difference between urban and rural respondents. Only a slight percentage of rural respondents gave more credibility to police performance.

Similarly both refugees and non-refugees gave a high percentage of credibility. As far as "no credibility" is concerned, a large percentage of all non-refugees indicated that the police are not credible.

Secondary educated respondents seem to be more critical and sceptical about the police's behaviour and conduct. All three academic groups have registered high percentages of credibility. As far as "no credibility" is concerned, secondary-educated respondents have the highest proportion of responses. Additionally, a great percentage of all elementary-educated respondents indicated that

police are not biassed in their behaviour, in comparison with secondary and university-educated respondents. These results are parallel and correlate with previous findings.

Ways in which the Police Mistreat the Public

The majority of the respondents indicated that the major cause of dissatisfaction relates to favouritism (note Table 2.8). This was indicated by 15-29 year olds who come from urban areas. The second cause relates to the pursuit of youth by the police. Thirdly, the dissatisfied respondents indicated that the reason of their dissatisfaction relates to police softness i.e. no strict policy.

It is interesting to note that a high proportion of the dissatisfied subjects failed to respond. It is shown that the above table relates only to 15.1% of the sample.

Scope for Improvement

As shown in Tables 2.9, 2.10 a large percentage of the respondents indicated that there are areas where improvements can be made. Only a small proportion of the respondents said that there is no need for improvement. Although the majority of the respondents have pointed out that certain areas need improvement, still a considerable percentage feel that no improvements are required.

Comparing the two sexes, as far as police improvement is concerned, I see that both sexes have an equal proportion of suggestions for improvements in the police force.

All three age groups overwhelmingly agree that the police needs some improvements. Some age groups agree more than the others. Younger people feel strongly that the police needs improvements while older people do not all approve of any changes.

It is clear that among urban respondents there is a

greater sense of criticism, in comparison to rural population.

A large proportion of non-refugees feel that the police need no improvement while the representative figure for refugees is lower. It is rather strange to find that among non-refugees the figure of "no changes" is lower than refugees. I expected to find that non-refugees would have been more dissatisfied and would have expressed this by responding overwhelmingly to "yes". This conclusion is drawn by earlier responses, i.e. on police credibility and police performance. It seems the refugees feel apprehension when it comes to suggestions for improvements contrary to current beliefs on the sociological make-up of refugees: it is believed that they should feel hostility towards authority because of their victimization during the 1974 war. Refugees in general might have a different opinion about the police but, when it comes to being critical and expressing suggestions for improvements, they are somehow inhibited.

All three academic groups have a high proportion of suggestions for improvement. Overwhelmingly, university-educated respondents indicated more than others that the police need improvement. Elementary-educated respondents indicated improvements with a smaller percentage.

Areas in which the Police should Spend More Time

Table 2.11 presents the suggestions and areas where police should spend more time or make improvements. Top on the list come improvements in traffic. It must be noted that some respondents gave more than one answer. Second on the list come improvements on patrols. Other areas where the police need to spend time according to the sample are: protection of the youth and prevention of crime in general. Then follows security in public places and security in playing grounds. A small proportion indicated that the

police should spend more time in the prevention of drug abuse. Other suggestions for the police to spend more time on are: prevention of thefts, prevention of sexual offences, prevention of disturbances, and prevention of gambling. Table 2.11 includes other suggestions for improvements with a lower proportion of responses.

Reasons why the Police are Not Able to Fulfil their Task

Studying Table 2.12 shows a list of reasons that in the respondents' opinion the police do not perform their designated role. First on the list is police indifference. Second on the list is police deficiency. The respondents felt that the police are not efficient. This results from a bad performance of their duty. Another answer relates to traffic offences. I can speculate that an increase in traffic offences might be the reason why a large number of police officers are preoccupied with such offences. A lot of effort is drained from the police manpower. As a consequence, the police run after traffic offences without giving emphasis on other criminal acts. A further percentage of the respondents said that the inefficiencies presented on Table 2.12 were the result of bad police organization and programming. Another proportion of responses relate to the exploitation of the issue of youth. When the police force turn their attention to the policing of youth then again they drain personnel from their pool of manpower with the above mentioned results i.e. not giving emphasis on other sections of policing. Other reasons that indicate poor police performance according to Table 2.12 are: police laziness, preoccupation of police with other business in general, bureaucratic police, spending time on unimportant issues, a genuine rise of crime, police officers not performing their duty correctly, police officers having no education or skills to combat crime, not

enough police patrols, no police discipline, police favouritism, no community policing policy, and other reasons.

2.6 DISCUSSION

Overwhelmingly, the majority of the respondents have indicated that police performance in Cyprus is approved. Mainly, the old and rural residents favour such policing method, in comparison with other social groups studied. What is interesting to note in this section is the presentation of data concerning suggestions for improving police behaviour. The majority of the answers relate to policing matters i.e. "more police patrols" "interest" "education of the police" as well as "police discipline". These suggestions are conflicting with those presented by Maclean et al (1986). The above study has shown that the Islington respondents gave priorities to "immediate response to 999 call", "crime investigation", "deterrent presence on the streets" as well as "control of sports grounds and public meetings". Perhaps it is appropriate here to point that people's attitude, when measured, reflects a reading relevant to a specific period of time as well as certain geographic location, on a specific society, giving concern to specific social problems.

When comparing the above, it is shown that the Cypriots are more concerned with functional and organizational matters of the police, while in Islington the respondents are more concerned with crime-orientated behaviour, such as policing policies, as well as implementation of certain methods.

It is quite clear that the Cypriot police are judged on the context that they present structural defects, while in Islington, as one representation of England and Wales, the police are judged on the context that they are unable to control crime.

It is assumed that either the Cypriot police are doing well in crime control or they are not involved with it at all. (This is the case when social control is achieved through social contract of "collective conscience" of Durkheim). The above explains why the Cypriots are not concerned with the police as a crime control agent. The above assumption goes both ways. I am inclined to accept the fact that the police are not much involved in crime control, because the society takes care of this and as a result does not give any cause for concern or criticism, for policing issues.

The above statements endorse the role of the Cypriot police as stated in an earlier chapter.

As far as an emergency response is concerned, it is shown that the Cypriots again overwhelmingly have indicated that the Police will respond immediately. This contradicts the data from Maclean et al (1986). Only 34.5% of the respondents from Islington have indicated satisfaction with police response to 999. I assume that by answering 'yes', the Cypriot sample have indicated their level of satisfaction. Therefore, both sets of data are comparable.

It is crucial for the people to believe that the police will respond immediately to an emergency for various reasons:

1. Police concern
2. Ability to clear up cases more easily.
3. Control of the situation.

The above reasons shape the people's attitude positively towards the police. If they have a negative experience concerning the above, then the people's opinion towards the police and policing in general will be a dissatisfaction. In Cyprus, the police are able to respond immediately on account of:

1. Confined area
2. Density of police

Only in the town of Nicosia which occupies an area of 200sq km there are six police stations.

1. Lycavitos station
2. Pili Paphou station
3. Omorphita station
4. Ayios Dometios station
5. Strovolos station
6. Police H/Q

These are only in the municipality and Urban areas.

With reference to whether the police behaves fairly and equally to all people, Cypriot data show that almost 80% of the respondents gave a positive answer. This coincides with responses from P.S.I (Smith 1983) and I.C.S. (Maclean et al 1986) which point out that only 70% of all respondents indicated police fairness. However younger people believe less in the above assumption.

Furthermore, the Cypriot respondents have indicated the degree of unfairness. The majority have said that this was due to favouritism on the part of the police towards certain people as well as unfair treatment towards the young ones. Up to some extent, the youngsters' dissatisfaction is explained on account that they see themselves as receiving an unfair treatment by the police. On the other hand, favouritism is explained in the sense that certain people or groups of people receive favoured treatment on account of their special relationship with the police, i.e. family, friendship etc. This can be explained through the fact that the policemen are interacting more with society at a personal level (Note police high density and social control mechanisms)

Finally, the Cypriot respondents have indicated that the police should spend more time on specific functions. Again, the majority of the respondents have indicated that they wish to see more time spent in other areas of

policing. However, this does not mean that the public are right and that if the police spend more time in these areas it will inevitably lead to the elimination of criminality. (This section, mainly, deals with the public's perception, feelings and attitudes as to what is missing from this current policing method). Explanation for the formation of such attitude evolves from personal experience. (See chapter 7 on the issue of evaluation of criminality and fear of crime through experience in Cyprus).

The majority of the people indicated that the police should spend more time on "traffic control" rather than "serious crime control". Even if the Police initiated a drive towards deterrence of traffic offences, it is documented that motorists will be critical of such policy (Belson 1975). Dix and Layzel (1985) suggest that the application of zealous traffic law enforcement is not as great as is commonly supposed. The main cause of generalised anti-police sentiment is where a stop for a traffic offence is used as a pretext for a crime check.

Priority to traffic control contradicts the priorities of those found in the I.C.S. which indicates that the police should spend more time on serious crime control. The above findings suggest that the Cypriots perceive traffic offences as a major issue of crime. Earlier on, Cypriot respondents indicated that traffic offences are the major cause for police contact. Therefore, there is a circular argument without beginning and end. The one issue reinforces the other.

Going back to the I.C.S., it is shown that the priorities given by the sample in Islington refer to serious crime aspects, whereas in Cyprus the priorities concern traffic control. This states the low level of seriousness of crime in the country as well as the low concern people place on it.

In answer as to what the reasons for the police are in

not spending much time in the above areas, Cypriots have indicated that this is mostly due to "police indifference", "deficiency in personnel", and "an increase of traffic offences". I believe that there is a misconception here. Although there is such a high police density in the country, still the public believes that police inefficiency is due to personnel shortage. What is interesting to note is the opinion that the police show "indifference". This is no surprise. Some people will wonder: since the police are not directly involved in crime deterrence or crime control, how can they show interest as well as involvement? Some respondents will show dissatisfaction with police performance on account of personal experience or because they are not affected by the conformity of the universal moral codes.

When observing the data, it shows that the critical respondents are in their majority urban residents. As it has already been shown in urban centres, family clustering is gradually deteriorating in Cyprus on account of the reasons mentioned earlier in the survey. On account of these findings, public dissatisfaction increases parallel to the increase of urbanization.

In the future, I expect to find more public dissatisfaction unless the police restores confidence in the public or assist in the reconstruction of social chains in urban centres, or at least participate actively in these associations or increase the parameters of the city-village (Alderson 1979). Previously, it was stated that almost every family or clan has its own policeman, which in a way replaces the head figure. What might currently be happening is that this new assumed head figure is turning professional.

"By police professionalism I mean the idea that the role of the police in the social order becomes defined by the police. When the weakening of local influences is combined with professional certitude the way is opened up for the police to become an institution in itself" (Alderson 1985 p.15).

By distancing himself from the family unit, the policeman leaves a vacuum in the system of social order. In essence, there is nobody left behind to assume the position of the family head and social controller.

Tables of Chapter Two

Table 2.1 Perception of police performance in general. Absolute numbers

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | |
|-------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEME | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| 1.Very Good | 71 | 34 | 37 | 38 | 30 | 3 | 20 | 51 | 43 | 28 | 13 | 26 | 32 |
| 2.Good | 252 | 130 | 122 | 122 | 105 | 25 | 83 | 169 | 159 | 93 | 75 | 69 | 88 |
| 3.Fair | 79 | 46 | 33 | 23 | 49 | 7 | 34 | 45 | 65 | 14 | 38 | 26 | 15 |
| 4.Poor | 20 | 10 | 10 | - | 16 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 18 | 2 | 15 | 3 | 2 |
| 5.No Answer | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |

Table 22 Perception of police performance in general, Percentages

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEME</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1.Very Good | 16.5 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 20.5 | 14.6 | 7.7 | 13.9 | 17.8 | 14.9 | 19.9 | 9.0 | 20.8 | 22.7 |
| 2.Good | 58.6 | 58.0 | 52.2 | 66.0 | 51.0 | 64.1 | 57.6 | 59.1 | 55.0 | 66.0 | 52.1 | 55.2 | 62.4 |
| 3.Fair | 18.4 | 20.5 | 16.0 | 12.4 | 23.8 | 17.9 | 23.6 | 15.7 | 22.5 | 9.9 | 26.4 | 20.8 | 10.6 |
| 4.Poor | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.9 | - | 7.8 | 10.3 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 1.4 | 10.4 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| 5.No Answer | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.8 | - | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 8.0 | 2.9 |

Table 2.3 Reasons of improvement of police behaviour.

| | 15-19 U R | 30-44 U R | 45-60 U R | TOTAL | # |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|------|
| BASE | (56) | (30) | (21) | (107) | |
| 1. No favouritism | 5 | 3 | | 12 | 11.2 |
| 2. Educate police | 7 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 16.8 |
| 3. Improve police behaviour | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5.6 |
| 4. Improve traffic | 2 | | | 2 | 1.9 |
| 5. More patrols | 3 | 2 | 1 | 31 | 29.0 |
| 6. Improve police organ. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 7.5 |
| 7. Enforcement of Law | 2 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 11.2 |
| 8. More police powers | 1 | | | 1 | 1.0 |
| 9. Police discipline | 3 | 9 | 3 | 18 | 16.8 |
| 10. Police interest | 7 | 6 | 4 | 22 | 20.6 |
| 11. Police strictness | 2 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 15.9 |
| 12. Reinforce police | 5 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 12.3 |
| 13. Public assistance | | | 3 | 6 | 5.6 |
| 14. More police stations | 1 | | 2 | 5 | 4.7 |
| 15. Energetic Offices | 1 | | | 4 | 3.7 |
| TOTAL | 41 | 19 | 20 | 173 | 100 |

Table 2.4 Police response in an emergency. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N. REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 322 | 172 | 150 | 151 | 142 | 29 | 96 | 203 | 207 | 115 | 83 | 100 | 139 |
| NO | 72 | 36 | 36 | 13 | 52 | 7 | 28 | 44 | 52 | 20 | 48 | 14 | 10 |
| DIK | 36 | 16 | 20 | 21 | 12 | 3 | 20 | 16 | 30 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 12 |

Table 2.5 Police response in an emergency. Percentages.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 74.9 | 76.8 | 72.8 | 81.6 | 68.9 | 74.4 | 66.7 | 71.0 | 71.6 | 81.6 | 57.6 | 80.0 | 86.3 |
| NO | 16.7 | 16.1 | 17.5 | 7.0 | 25.2 | 17.9 | 19.4 | 15.4 | 18.0 | 14.1 | 33.3 | 11.2 | 6.2 |
| DIK | 8.4 | 7.1 | 9.7 | 11.4 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 13.9 | 5.6 | 10.4 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 7.5 |

Table 2.6 Police behaviour portraits justice. Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 340 | 184 | 156 | 160 | 148 | 32 | 117 | 223 | 223 | 117 | 96 | 106 | 138 |
| NO | 65 | 26 | 39 | 16 | 44 | 5 | 17 | 48 | 46 | 19 | 37 | 15 | 13 |
| DIK | 25 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 10 |

Table 2.7 **Police behaviour portraits justice. Percentages.**

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N. REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 79.1 | 82.1 | 75.7 | 86.5 | 71.8 | 82.1 | 81.3 | 78.0 | 72.2 | 83.0 | 66.7 | 84.8 | 85.7 |
| NO | 15.1 | 11.6 | 18.9 | 8.6 | 21.4 | 12.8 | 11.8 | 16.8 | 15.9 | 13.4 | 25.7 | 12.0 | 8.1 |
| DIK | 5.8 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 4.9 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 3.6 | 7.6 | 3.2 | 6.2 |

Table 2.8 Ways in which police are not just in their
behaviour towards the public.

| | 15-29 | | 30-44 | | 45-60 | | TOTAL | % |
|---------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|---|-------|-------|
| | U | R | U | R | U | R | | |
| BASE | (37) | (15) | (13) | (65) | 100 | | | |
| 1. Maltreatment | 12 | 5 | 2 | | | | 2 | 3.1 |
| 2. Favouritism | | 4 | | | | | 23 | 35.4 |
| 3. Not Stricked | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 4 | 6.2 |
| 4. Parking Offence | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 1.5 |
| 5. Trafffic Offence | 6 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | 3.1 |
| 6. Pursued of Youth | | 1 | | | | | 9 | 13.8 |
| 7. Biased | 6 | 2 | 8 | | | | 3 | 4.6 |
| 8. No Answer | | 6 | 3 | | | | 29 | 44.6 |
| TOTAL | 27 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 73 | 100.0 |

Table 2.9 Police spending more time on certain aspects of policing
Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-22</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 189 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 284 | 149 | 135 | 110 | 138 | 36 | 102 | 182 | 200 | 84 | 103 | 91 | 90 |
| NO | 110 | 56 | 54 | 59 | 50 | 1 | 28 | 82 | 63 | 47 | 29 | 23 | 58 |
| DIK | 36 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 2 | 14 | 22 | 26 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 13 |

Table 2.10 Police spending more time on certain aspects of policing. Percentages

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 66.0 | 66.5 | 65.5 | 59.5 | 67.0 | 92.3 | 70.8 | 63.6 | 69.2 | 59.6 | 71.5 | 72.8 | 55.9 |
| NO | 25.6 | 25.0 | 26.2 | 31.9 | 24.3 | 2.6 | 19.4 | 28.7 | 21.8 | 33.3 | 20.1 | 18.4 | 36.0 |
| DIK | 8.4 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 5.1 | 9.8 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 8.8 | 8.1 |

Table 2.11 Areas in which police should spend more time with.

| BASE | 15-29 U (103) | 30-44 U (91) | 45-60 U (90) | TOTAL (284) | % |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------|
| 1. Patrols | 9 | 11 | 8 | 43 | 15.1 |
| 2. Traffic | 37 | 31 | 32 | 150 | 52.8 |
| 3. Narcotics | 10 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 6.0 |
| 4. Thefts | 4 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 3.2 |
| 5. Protection of Youth | 8 | 14 | 5 | 33 | 11.6 |
| 6. Strictness | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 0.7 |
| 7. Sexual Offences | | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2.1 |
| 8. Prevent Crime in general | 6 | 12 | 6 | 33 | 11.6 |
| 9. Security in public places | 7 | 5 | 4 | 21 | 7.4 |
| 10. Protect tourists: | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 11. Disturbances | 4 | | 2 | 6 | 2.1 |
| 12. Security in playing grounds | 11 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 6.7 |
| 13. Schools | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 14. Better Policing | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1.8 |
| 15. Protection of Citizens | | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1.8 |
| 16. Gambling | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2.5 |
| 17. Social events | 2 | | | 2 | 0.7 |
| 18. Other | 5 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 3.2 |
| TOTAL | 101 | 89 | 77 | 355 | |

Table 2.12 Reasons as to why police are not spending enough time
on main issues.

| BASE | 15-29 U (103) | 30-44 U (91) | 45-60 U (90) | TOTAL (284) | % | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|----|------|-----|
| 1. Deficiency in personnel | 13 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 35 | 12.3 | |
| 2. Laziness | | | | 1 | 2 | 0.7 | |
| 3. Preoccupation | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2.8 | |
| 4. Indifferent | 19 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 57 | 20.0 | |
| 5. No Orqanization | 12 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 8.1 | |
| 6. Spend time on details | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1.4 | |
| 7. Not important | 1 | | | | 1 | 0.3 | |
| 8. Rise Of Crime | 2 | | 5 | 1 | 8 | 2.8 | |
| 9. Exploit the issue of youth | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 12 | 4.2 | |
| 10.Do not perform correctly their duty | 1 | | 1 | | 6 | 2.1 | |
| 11.Increase of traffic offences | | | | | | | |
| 12.No education | | 5 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 12.0 | |
| 13.No patrols | 1 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 2.5 | |
| 14.No discipline | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 9 | 3.2 | |
| 15.Favouritism | | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 1.4 | |
| 16.No community policing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0.3 | |
| 17.Other | | | | 2 | 2 | 0.7 | |
| TOTAL | 56 | 21 | 48 | 19 | 54 | 16 | 214 |

CHAPTER 3

IMAGES OF THE POLICE

3.1 SUMMARY

Cypriots are noted for their political awareness. They not only believe in politics but they also live and die with it. This is evident by the fact that I have observed several divisions in the country on account of politics. Politics is responsible for mass conformity which is a part of "collective conscience". In this chapter I will show the effect politics has on the police as well as policing issues.

Although the respondents believe that the police are acting satisfactorily when it comes to controlling strikes and demonstrations, they still have the opinion that the police are favourable towards government sympathizers as well as friends and relatives; treatment is more favourable to these groups.

The above derives from the fact that the police:

1. Carry a traditional labelling as a supporter of a specific political section.
2. High acquaintance level make them vulnerable to accusations of not being fair.

3.2 POLICING POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND LABOUR DEMONSTRATIONS.

Level of Satisfaction from the Personal Perspective

It must be noted that 383 respondents out of 430 were present in a demonstration of one kind or another. The results in this chapter refer to this majority of subjects who were present in such events. Out of these respondents,

who were present in such events, the majority of them found policing adequate and satisfactory and about a third felt that the police's behaviour was not good, either biased or inadequate. Another 15.6% of the respondents did not answer - note Tables 3.1,3.2.

It seems that almost all males did participate in such events; 60.7% of them said that they were satisfied by the police's unbiased behaviour. Although there is a high approval percentage among males, still one quarter of them did not think so. It is interesting to note that only half of the females approve of the police's methods of policing such events. I was expecting to find that males would be more critical of the police due to previous criticism. An explanation to the above states that 9.8% of females did not respond, which affected the approval percentage by decreasing it below proportions.

It must be noted that in this question I did not ask for any time span. Therefore, the high percentage of participation in the responses is accepted on the grounds that old people could have participated in more demonstrations, strikes, or other such events where police presence was required. The greatest rate of satisfaction among the age groups is that of the 30-44 years old and the highest dissatisfaction is that of the 15-29 years old.

There is a high percentage of approval by all age groups. However, in spite of this, the older age group has reservations about police conduct. Perhaps, due to their long experience, the old people might have considered some negative criticism towards police behaviour because they have associated this with colonial policing. It is, therefore, not clear whether old people were expressing an attitude towards present policing or colonial policing. This issue must be clarified in terms of time limitation. On the same issue, the old people might have registered dissatisfaction with the colonial policing rather than

current policing.

Studying the participation of the urban respondents, I find that almost all of them did participate in the above events. As far as the rural respondents are concerned, only 84.4% of them participated in a demonstration. Of the urban respondents that participated in such events, 58.7% were satisfied with the police's behaviour, while 26.1% were dissatisfied. Out of the rural respondents only 49.6% were satisfied while 33.6% were dissatisfied. As far as "no answer" is concerned, 15.2% of the urban respondents and 16.8% of the rural respondents refused to answer. It is interesting to note that rural respondents have a higher dissatisfaction proportion which is somewhat unexpected. In previous sections of the survey rural respondents were satisfied with police conduct and behaviour which renders contradiction of responses.

Comparing the proportion of refugees who took part in the above events I see that 86.1% did participate as opposed to 90.6% of all non-refugees. Both groups have a high proportion of participation. As far as approval of police's behaviour is concerned, I see that among the refugees more than half of the respondents indicated that the police were unbiased, a fifth said that the police were biased and not conducting themselves according to their duty. As far as non-refugees are concerned, again more than half of them indicated approval of police's methods while a third said the opposite. The essence of the above table is that among non-refugees there is a high proportion of dissatisfaction of police practices as far as policing demonstrations, strikes, and other social events is concerned. It is shown that the above results correlate with the general opinion which non-refugees have against the police. Previous tables show that non-refugees are more critical and dissatisfied with police practices.

Comparing the participation of the three academic

groups in the above mentioned events, I see that elementary educated respondents have a 87% participation, secondary-educated respondents have a 90.3% participation and university-educated respondents have a 92.3% participation.

Among the three academic groups, I see that all of them have a high percentage of approval. University-educated respondents have the highest approval rate while those with the less academic achievement have the highest rate of disapproval. This, in a way, correlates with the fact that older people are elementary educated. For this reason, it might not be the case of academic achievement but rather due to experience and old age. Again, a specific definition in the questionnaire about time of occurrence would have solved the above issue.

It must be noted that among elementary and secondary-educated respondents the "no response" is very high. This can insinuate that university-educated respondents have more conviction in their opinion and they are not afraid to say so.

Level of Satisfaction out of Awareness

Tables 3.3, 3.4 relate to those subjects who did not take part in any demonstrations, strikes, etc. The question asked is whether the respondents believe that the police are fair and unbiased in their policing of such events.

Out of those respondents that did not take part in any of the above events, nine out of ten express the opinion that the police will conduct themselves without bias. Only a small percentage said that they will be biased.

The majority of both males and females expressed the opinion that police will be fair and unbiased.

The above tables show that the overwhelming majority of the respondents of all age groups expressed a high approval rate, that the police are fair when policing the

above mentioned events. It is interesting to note that all old age respondents believe that the police are fair when policing demonstrations. Again this contradicts a previous section where it was shown that old people show dissatisfaction with the police when policing demonstrations. A detailed investigation is required in order to clarify the issue. A correct question about time of occurrence would have solved a lot of enquiries.

The overwhelming majority of urban and rural respondents who did not participate in any of the above events expressed the opinion that police are unbiased and their behaviour is rather good.

Both refugees and non-refugees present a high percentage of approval even though they were not present in such events. Only one in ten of non-participant non-refugees expressed the opinion that the police are biased in their policing methods.

All three academic groups expressed with high percentages the opinion that the police are not biased when they are policing events such as demonstrations, strikes, and other social events. About 33% of the university-educated respondents indicated dissatisfaction. This is not significant because of the low number of respondents in this variable.

3.3 POLICING OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR POLITICAL POLARIZATION

Different Policing Method

Tables 3.5, 3.6 are similar to Tables 3.4, 3.3. They show responses concerning whether the police are objective against students, culture, labour and political events, considering their political and social polarization and characteristics. In essence, this shows whether political events organized by one specific political party are receiving a different treatment by the police in comparison

with events from other political parties. In previous sections I have enquired about policing methods; here I enquire about the police's objectivity considering differences of ideology and political background of the events.

The majority of the respondents indicated that the police are objective while one fifth said the opposite and a further one fifth (a significant figure) abstained, i.e. did not give an answer. It must be noted that the questionnaire was conducted in a period of no political activity, i.e. no elections, either presidential, parliamentary, or for local authorities. It must also be noted that the police receive a lot of publicity in the press for their assumed pro-governmental stand. This has an effect on people's attitudes. I am in a position to acknowledge that this survey was conducted in a period of political calm away from extremism and strong publicity. Police all over the world come under a considerable pressure during elections or political changes, mostly on crime and justice issues. In European countries, crime issues are considered as one of the top three topics in political manifestos at election time.

Both males and females rated police objectivity very highly. It is important to note the "no answer" which among the males is 12.1% and a significant figure of 29.7% among the females. The essence is that, although among the males there is a high percentage of "yes" replies to objectivity, there is also a significant percentage of "No" replies to police objectivity, when compared with the answers of the females. It is interesting to note that a high proportion of all females did not answer. The same situation was found in Tables 3.1, 3.2 where females were more inclined not to give an answer. Does this mean that a significant proportion of females do not know or do not care about police's behaviour in general? As it will be

shown later on, there is a great level of crime tolerance by the females in Cyprus which is based on sociological factors. Tolerance might also imply indifference.

All three age groups gave a considerably high percentage on police objectivity. In the "No objectivity" column they showed 26.4%, 23.2% and 15.5% respectively. Among the younger respondents there is a higher rate of disapproval in comparison with the older subjects. The above results conflict with the results from Tables 3.1, 3.2. In Tables 3.1, 3.2 older respondents disapproved of the police's methods of policing a specific event, while in Tables 3.6, 3.5 only a fraction of respondents said that the police were not objective in dealing with political polarized events. The most likely explanation might be the fact that in Tables 3.5, 3.6 more respondents refused to answer as opposed to those in Tables 3.1, 3.2. This might have had an effect on the percentages on the grounds that it deflated the "no objectivity" figures.

Both urban and rural people have a very high proportion of "yes" replies to police's objectivity. Both groups have a considerable high proportion of refusal to answer. The trends found in Tables 3.1, 3.2 etc show that a significant proportion of respondents find police as not objective. Neither do they approve of police's methods when policing demonstrations, strikes, and other social events.

Among refugees and non-refugees there is a high level of credibility. The above results bear similarities and in a way there is a certain correlation with the respective Tables 3.1, 3.2. One must also note the high proportion of "No answer", which is very high considering "No answer" rates from previous questions.

The highest credibility proportion is among elementary educated respondents. The essence of the above tables is that among elementary-educated respondents the disapproval

is lower than secondary-educated respondents and even lower than university-educated respondents. It seems that university and secondary-educated respondents are more critical of the police's objectivity than elementary-educated respondents. The above results are similar to those of Tables 3.1, 3.2.

Events in which the Policing Method is Different

With regard to events in which the policing method is different, it is shown that political events are on top of the list on Table 3.7 with an overwhelming majority of responses. It must be noted that these answers were given by those respondents who answered "No" to the previous issue referring to police credibility. Therefore, these answers reflect the opinion of 21.4% of the sample and one should not generalize the results as being representative of the whole population of Cyprus. Other events that have been considered as receiving no objective treatment by the police are cultural, athletic, labour, musical, student and a combination of all events. It must be noted that another 3.3% failed to answer.

Another observation on Table 3.7 is that the majority of the respondents were young people from urban areas.

The Reasons why the Policing Method is Different

Again it must be noted that the following responses refer to the 21.4% of the sample that answered "No" to objectivity. Table 3.8 refers to the reasons as to why policing method is different. The majority of the answers relate to the issue of the police being sympathetic to the government. Other reasons given to the above question relate to the opinion that the police are not objective to certain political parties. Another reason mentioned is

that the police are not objective because of favouritism by the police. Another reason states that the police are not objective towards their acquaintances and friends. Favouritism is an undisputed fact which is found in all levels of administration, police, judicial system, commerce etc. It is institutionalized and sanctioned by most members of the society. Another small percentage pointed out that the police do not know any better and this is why they are not objective.

3.4 CREDIBILITY OF POLICING METHODS

Policing Social, Political, and Economic Groups

This section enquires whether the police are objective in their behaviour against certain people in the society. In the previous section the main theme was events. Now I consider whether the police treat differently certain people in the Cypriot society.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents indicated that the police are objective when contacting people (note Tables 3.9, 3.10). The above results are somewhat similar to the results in Tables 3.1, 3.2.

Both males and females rated police objectivity very high. As far as objectivity in police practices is concerned, a quarter of males and a quarter of females indicated that the police are biased and not fair in their treatment of citizens. In the above figures there is not any significant difference among the sexes.

All three age groups expressed the opinion that the police are objective in their treatment. Younger respondents have the highest proportion of approval of police objectivity. The highest non-objective ratio was among 45+ year olds. The essence is that among 30-44 year olds and 45+ year olds there is a significant proportion of respondents that consider police practices as non-objective. The high proportion of "no answer" of 30-44

year olds is crucial in the sense that it deflates all other readings. The above results are similar to those from Tables 3.5, 3.6.

Comparing urban and rural respondents, I found that among the urban respondents there is a much higher "yes" response to the question while among the rural group there are fewer "Yes" answers. It seems that rural respondents have the opinion that police behaviour is biased as far as treatment is concerned. The most likely explanation for this result is that urban respondents are interacting more with the police due to the high density of police in urban areas. This allows them to express an opinion from a position of experience.

Both refugees and non-refugees indicated a high proportion of police objectivity. Seven out of ten of all refugees said "Yes" to police objectivity, while among non-refugees the proportion is slightly less. The essence is that among the non-refugees the dissatisfaction (as far as police behaviour is concerned) is much greater than those of the sample of refugees. The above result is similar to that found in previous tables.

All three academic groups accept police fairness with a high proportion. As far as no objectivity is concerned, the highest proportion of respondents who said police are using no objective treatment come from the elementary-educated respondents, with a proportion of 31.4%. Tables 3.9, 3.10 present reciprocal relations with the results from Tables 3.5, 3.6. In Tables 3.5, 3.6 respondents indicated that police are objective when they are policing certain political events. There is some form of inconsistency of response. The "No" response of Tables 3.9, 3.10 are 5.4%, 7.2% and 20.6% respectively. In Tables 3.9, 3.10 it is shown that the high proportion of "No" answers is among university-educated subjects.

Groups of People who Receive Different Treatment from the Police.

Table 3.11 includes responses made by subjects indicating the people that police might not be objective to. It is noted that certain respondents gave more than one answer. A high proportion of the respondents (all respondents have answered the question) indicated that the police are not objective towards their acquaintances either in their professional or in their social capacity . Another proportion said that the police are not objective towards their friends and relatives. A further percentage said that the police are not objective towards those people with "MESA" (a Greek expression for those who have political and social advantages over others, either contacts, associates or acquaintances). Then follows a "no" objective policy towards criminals. In this section I am not concerned with whether police behaviour is positive or negative towards criminals. I am only presenting responses which are concerned with different treatment towards criminals in general.

Other social groups or people (that the respondents have indicated) who receive a "no" objective treatment by the police are: the powerful, civil servants, young people, rich people, vagrants, members of political opposition, suspects.

It must be noted that around one third of the sample did not give an answer. I must make it clear that the above table refers to all respondents that took part in the survey and not only those 25.3% of the respondents that had the opinion that the police are not objective towards certain people or groups of people.

In question number 12b all respondents were asked to express an opinion irrelevant to whether they have answered "Yes" or "No" to question number 12.

Ways in which Treatment by the Police is Different Towards Certain Groups of People.

It must be noted that the people and social groups that were identified in Table 3.11 are now defined with the ways in which the police treat them differently. It is shown that Table 3.12 refers to the whole sample of respondents as in Table 3.11. Again some respondents gave more than one answer.

In answering how the police are not objective in their behaviour and treatment of people, I find that 42.6% of them, a rather high percentage (and significant), said that the police are favourable towards them (the people mentioned earlier on). Another small percentage said that the police are harsh towards certain people while another 5% said that the police are rather helpful towards the above mentioned people. Other adjectives used by the respondents to describe the police's non objective behaviour are: polite, lenient and discriminating. Others (with less than 1%) are: no patience, no prosecution, flexibility and ignorance.

The proportion of no answer responses is around 30%. The majority of the above responses relate to the positive discrimination of the police rather than the negative discrimination. Positive discriminations are a) Favourable b) Helpful c) Polite d) Lenient e) No persecution f) Flexible g) Ignorant.

3.5 DISCUSSION

In addition to the study of personal satisfaction out of policing methods, I found it necessary to investigate the relationship between police and organized groups in the Cypriot society, such as political parties, trade unions, students etc. The main guess is to find out whether policing such organized groups is satisfactory to the public. As it has already been mentioned, conformity in the

Cypriot society is one cultural characteristic which aids grouping. It is the intention of this section to find whether there is conflict in the various sub-cultures or sub-groupings in accepting symbolic authority or whether certain groups more than others emit a sense of acceptability of police behaviour. It seems there is contradiction of the evaluation of police behaviour, from various subgroups in the Cypriot society. For this reason there is less cooperation with some groups in the society. Political parties, trade unions, football clubs are natural divisions of sub-cultures. I have decided to investigate this line because I believe that the Cypriots take much concern in politics. They apply and relate politics in all aspects of society. In sports, for instance, there are right wing football teams such as "Apoel" and left wing teams such as "Omonia". There are also right wing trade unions such as "S.E.K." and left wing such as "P.E.O". There are also right and left wing coffee houses as well as right and left wing groceries.

In essence, today's politics are an organic issue. Everything is explained in terms of politics and, therefore, there is a continuous conflict, mainly relating to the issue of us against them. A group of Cypriot scholars have identified the above facts within the context of describing the life in a Cypriot village "Lysi" (Markides et al 1978).

Bearing in mind the troublesome contemporary history of Cyprus, I am inclined to state that the Cypriot police force is also in the middle of this conflict in politics. The Cypriot police, although it is said to be the servant of every consecutive government, it still cannot shake away labelling. The policemen are mostly known as "Makariaki" which name is derived from the police support given to the late Archbishop Makarios, when a Greek sponsored military coup was launched against him. As a result of the

unsuccessful military coup, the police force gained mixed feelings. Because of the then political instability, the police force, used discriminatory powers in recruiting policemen who supported the late president. The expulsion from the force of policemen supporting the right wingers reinforced the above labelling. As a result of this, the police force lost at one stage its credibility as a fair policing authority. Currently, the situation has changed and entry requirements of enlisting in the police force are slightly observed. However, this does not alter people's attitude towards police labelling.

Before elaborating on the results of this chapter, I find it necessary to point out that in Cyprus there are no occurrences of major labour disputes in order to create public unrest and headache to the police. The major industries or employers in Cyprus are either government sponsored or the government has shares in companies. These are called "Imigratikos Organismos". Such semi-public companies are: Telecommunications, Electricity authority, Cyprus Airways, Port authority, Radio and Television. Working conditions as well as pay is excellent in these companies and in essence there are no major labour disputes. The three main trade unions are known for their responsibility and co-operation. The private sector does not get mobilized very easily on account of disorganization and contradiction of interests. However, only some farmers' unions are actively applying pressure on the government every now and then to increase prices on products. These demonstrations are contacted peacefully and within the limits of the law.

Due to the constitutional system of the country, almost every two years there are either Presidential, Parliamentary, or Local elections. Again political demonstrations are peaceful and within the limits of the law. Years ago, demonstrations were a big headache for the

police due to the fact that these were noted for their extremism.

The only demonstrations which are organized by the young population today, are those by secondary schools mainly to oppose education cuts or to commemorate a political and national event.

Finally, the major concern of the police, is when it comes to policing political rallies as well as anti-invasion demonstrations. Often tempers rise high and, as a result, the police might use limited force to prevent unexpected events i.e. residents crossing the "Green-line" into the Turkish sector face arrest and detention, by the Turks.

It is interesting to note that almost 90% of the sample participated in a demonstration or a strike. Out of these people, the majority have indicated satisfaction with policing. The remaining sample which did not participate in any of the above have indicated in their majority that, as far as they were aware, policing these functions by the police is satisfactory.

Again, when the sample was asked as to whether the police are fair when policing such functions, the majority responded positively. From those respondents that gave a negative response which is around 20% of the sample, I have asked them to indicate the functions in which the police do not show fair treatment. Overwhelmingly, the respondents indicated that "political" functions were not policed fairly. In addition, I have asked again the same sample about the reasons for this unfair behaviour towards political functions. Again the majority of the respondents said that the police are not objective towards "government sympathizers" as well as "political party sympathizers". This shows that the police are in a way not acting objectively towards members of the governing political party. The term objective insinuates that the police are

too sympathetic with the above political groups.

This is not a new finding considering the experience of the London Metropolitan Police and various Police Constabularies in England and Wales. Often the British government (any) is accused that it is using the police to implement or support political policies (note miners' strikes during the early 80s as well as the C.N.D. demonstrations).

The above findings hide also a traditional element of criticism towards every consecutive government in Cyprus. With reference to the political polarization and political awareness in the country, surely politically dissatisfied people will believe that policing is unfair and it is in favour of a political party or people sympathetic to the government.

Unfortunately, I do not have any evidence in my hands in order to suggest that the police are unfair towards any political party or group of people. I must mention, however, that during the E.O.K.A. B' (1972-73 terrorist activities) the Cypriot government declared illegal the movement and its members, usually right wingers, were often arrested. The communist party A.K.E.L. did not give any cause for government concern at the time. However, communist sympathizers were rounded up in the early 30s when Cyprus was still a colony.

Statistically speaking, comparing the dissatisfied sample with the universe of the sample, I find that more than 10% indicated that the police are unfair when it comes to policing politically orientated events. Although the above figure is not significant, it is a percentage though which should present concern to the Cypriot Chief of Police.

In addition to the investigation of the respondents' attitude towards police controlling public functions, I have also investigated policing issues on a personal level.

The respondents also indicated that the police are not fair towards certain people. These people are in order of frequency:

1. Acquaintances
2. Friends and Relatives
3. Those that manipulate political and social means.
4. High class people.

In addition, I have asked the same respondents as to how police behaviour is not fair. The majority of the respondents said that this was on account that behaviour was "partial".

The above findings endorse all that has been said earlier concerning high police density and on how police are too friendly with the public. It is inevitable that certain sectors of the public will misunderstand this friendliness. I believe that some respondents have the opinion that the police abuse the system up to an extent. Almost 43% of the sample indicated synoptically that the police are favourable to the government sympathizers as well as their friends and relatives. Again this is another issue that the Cypriot Chief of Police should consider.

But what are the implications concerning social policing theory? Specifically, concerning community policing (Alderson 1979), I believe that one cannot fully apply the above theory in practice unless he first takes into consideration accusations that the police abuse powers or that they apply institutional discretion to certain groups of people. Therefore, there is a danger when wishing to apply community policing. This state of affairs will gradually lead to the public feeling suspicious of the police and will initiate an antagonistic reaction. As a consequence, the police will not be informed of matters associated with social control in the family. In other words, the police will be more isolated because there will always be the suspicion that it is acting on behalf of the

others and not us. I speculate that one cannot really speak of community policing (if this is what is happening in Cyprus) unless he takes into consideration the fact that he should accept a level of accusation and criticism by the public that police behaviour is not fair towards certain people, and that police are abusing powers.

The Cyprus divisions in the society are not unique and I cannot say that the above remarks refer only to this country. Other countries like England and Wales, for instance, have class segregation as well as race divisions. Therefore, if somebody initiates a community policing programme in England and Wales, it is likely that he will observe discontent by the public towards the police and accusation that the police are not fair. In the case of England and Wales, there are no additional bondings in the society to unite division such as cultural norms like the ones in Cyprus. In Cyprus the divisions of the left and right political parties have common elements such as kinship, religion, and cultural characteristics. Such bonds soften the conflict between the groups and divisions.

As a thought for future research I suggest to study, police responses towards specific political sympathizers.

Tables of Chapter Three

Table 3.1 Participant's satisfaction with police behaviour while policing a public demonstration, gathering etc. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N. REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 383 | 201 | 182 | 161 | 186 | 36 | 124 | 259 | 264 | 119 | 124 | 114 | 145 |
| YES | 214 | 122 | 92 | 76 | 114 | 24 | 68 | 146 | 155 | 59 | 74 | 71 | 69 |
| NO | 109 | 55 | 54 | 58 | 42 | 9 | 26 | 83 | 69 | 40 | 30 | 28 | 51 |
| DIK | 60 | 24 | 36 | 27 | 30 | 3 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 25 |

Table 3.2

Participant's satisfaction with police behaviour while policing a public demonstration, gathering etc. Percentages.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 55.9 | 60.7 | 50.5 | 47.2 | 61.3 | 66.7 | 54.8 | 56.4 | 58.7 | 49.6 | 59.7 | 62.3 | 47.6 |
| NO | 28.5 | 27.4 | 29.7 | 36.0 | 22.6 | 25.0 | 21.0 | 32.0 | 26.1 | 33.6 | 24.2 | 24.6 | 35.2 |
| DIK | 15.6 | 11.9 | 19.8 | 16.8 | 16.1 | 8.3 | 24.2 | 11.6 | 15.2 | 16.8 | 16.1 | 13.2 | 17.2 |

Table 3.3 Awareness: Satisfaction of police behaviour while policing a public demonstration,
gathering etc., Absolute numbers.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 47 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 20 | 3 | 20 | 27 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 11 | 16 |
| YES | 43 | 20 | 23 | 24 | 17 | 2 | 19 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 10 | 16 |
| NO | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 3.4 Awareness, Satisfaction of police behaviour while policing a public demonstration
gathering etc. Percentages

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 91.5 | 87.0 | 95.8 | 100 | 85.0 | 66.7 | 95.0 | 88.9 | 91.7 | 91.3 | 85.0 | 91.0 | 100 |
| NO | 8.5 | 13.0 | 4.2 | - | 15.0 | 33.3 | 5.0 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 15.0 | 9.0 | - |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 3.5 Police objectivity in policing student, political, labour events considering their political and social polarisation. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N. REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | | 430 | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | | 250 | 143 | 107 | 114 | 117 | 19 | 83 | 167 | 163 | 87 | 80 | 72 | 98 |
| NO | | 92 | 54 | 38 | 23 | 55 | 14 | 27 | 65 | 69 | 23 | 38 | 29 | 25 |
| DIK | | 88 | 27 | 61 | 48 | 34 | 6 | 34 | 54 | 57 | 31 | 26 | 24 | 38 |

Table 3.6 Police objectivity in policing student, political labour events considering their political and social polarisation. Percentages.

| | | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 58.1 | 63.8 | 51.9 | 61.6 | 56.8 | 48.7 | 57.6 | 58.4 | 56.4 | 61.7 | 55.6 | 57.6 | 60.9 |
| NO | 21.4 | 24.1 | 18.4 | 12.4 | 26.7 | 35.9 | 18.8 | 22.7 | 23.9 | 16.3 | 26.4 | 23.2 | 15.5 |
| DIK | 20.5 | 12.1 | 29.7 | 26.0 | 16.5 | 15.4 | 23.6 | 18.9 | 19.7 | 22.0 | 18.0 | 19.2 | 23.6 |

Table 3.7 Events in which police show no objectivity.

| BASE | 15-29 U (38) | 30-44 U (29) | 45-60 U (25) | TOTAL (92) | % 100 | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|---|----|------|
| 1. Political | 29 | 4 | 18 | 1 | 17 | 6 | 75 | 81.5 |
| 2. Cultural | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | 2.0 |
| 3. Athletic | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 | 2.0 |
| 4. Labour | 1 | | | | 2 | | 3 | 3.3 |
| 5. Musical | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1.1 |
| 6. Student | 2 | 1 | | | | | 3 | 3.3 |
| 7. All of them | 3 | | | | | | 3 | 3.3 |
| TOTAL | 38 | 5 | 20 | 1 | 19 | 6 | 89 | |

* Some people did not give an answer.

Table 3.8 The reasons for no objectivity by police.

| BASE | 15-29 U R (38) | 30-44 U R (29) | 45-60 U R (25) | TOTAL (92) | % |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|------|
| 1. Government Symp. | 14 | 4 | 8 | 31 | 33.7 |
| 2. Associates | 1 | | | 1 | 1.1 |
| 3. Political party sympatizers | 5 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 15.2 |
| 4. Personal pain | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 3.3 |
| 5. Favouritism | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 6.5 |
| 6. Institutionalised | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2.0 |
| 7. Do not know any better | | 1 | | 1 | 1.1 |
| TOTAL | 23 | 4 | 14 | 58 | |

* Some people did not give an answer

Table 3.9 Police fairness to all people. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | |
|------|-------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 224 | 206 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 154 | 134 | 117 | 147 | 24 | 102 | 186 | 200 | 88 | 106 | 76 | 106 |
| NO | 55 | 54 | 58 | 44 | 7 | 28 | 81 | 68 | 41 | 28 | 35 | 46 |
| DIK | 15 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 19 | 21 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 9 |

Table 3.10 Police fairness to all people. Percentages

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 67.0 | 68.7 | 65.0 | 63.2 | 71.4 | 61.5 | 70.8 | 65.0 | 69.2 | 62.4 | 73.6 | 60.8 | 65.8 |
| NO | 25.3 | 24.6 | 26.2 | 31.4 | 21.4 | 17.9 | 19.4 | 28.3 | 23.5 | 29.1 | 19.4 | 28.0 | 28.6 |
| DIK | 7.7 | 6.7 | 8.8 | 5.4 | 7.2 | 20.6 | 9.8 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 11.2 | 5.6 |

Table 3.11 Persons who receive different treatment by the police.

| BASE | 15-29 U (144) | 30-44 U (125) | 45-60 U (161) | TOTAL (430) | % 100 |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1. Criminals | 7 | 8 | 6 | 22 | 5.1 |
| 2. Acquaintances | 18 | 9 | 17 | 73 | 17.0 |
| 3. Powerful | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 4. Civil servants | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 5. Social high class people | 13 | 9 | 12 | 53 | 12.3 |
| 6. Friends/Relatives | 4 | 15 | 16 | 71 | 16.5 |
| 7. Young people | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1.2 |
| 8. Rich | 1 | 3 | | 5 | 1.2 |
| 9. Vagrants | 2 | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 10. Political opposition | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1.2 |
| 11. Suspects | | | | 1 | 0.3 |
| 12. Those that manipulate political & social means | 31 | 7 | 12 | 67 | 15.6 |
| 13. Favouritism | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1.0 |
| TOTAL | 84 | 33 | 57 | 312 | |

Table 3.12 Ways in which the police is not giving same treatment.

| BASE | 15-29 U (144) | 30-44 U (125) | 45-60 U (161) | TOTAL (430) | % |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|------|
| 1. Discrimination | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1.4 |
| 2. Polite | 3 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 3.3 |
| 3. Lenient | 6 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 2.3 |
| 4. Behaviour General | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 1.4 |
| 5. No Patience | | | 1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 6. Helpful | 6 | 2 | 11 | 21 | 4.9 |
| 7. Favourable | 45 | 36 | 36 | 183 | 42.6 |
| 8. Harsh | 7 | 9 | 7 | 26 | 6.0 |
| 9. Not Prosecuted | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 0.8 |
| 10. Flexible | 1 | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| 11. Ignore | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 0.5 |
| TOTAL | 71 | 53 | 67 | 273 | |

* Some people did not give an answer

PART TWO

VICTIMIZATION AND REPORTING OF CRIME

CHAPTER 4

AMOUNT OF VICTIMIZATION

4.1 SUMMARY

This chapter will consider various forms of victimization that exist in Cyprus in an ascending order of frequency. As a matter of reference, this study will employ a victimization survey in order to investigate the extent and patterns of criminality. In addition, these forms of victimization will be compared with those in other countries and define socio-economic factors that contribute to these specific patterns of victimization.

Furthermore, effort will be made to describe various agencies which detect crime. Also to define the reasons why victims do not come forward and report victimization.

I believe that crime reporting by victims is a) a factor of social tolerance to certain offence groups and b) public confidence in police practices.

People are more likely to report to the police victimization of relatives than strangers.

4.2 CASES OF VICTIMIZATION REPORTED ACCORDING TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS

Before calculating the dark figures of crime, it is necessary to present a general view of cases reported to

this survey per offence in relation to the variables. Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 present in detail the reported cases. Table 4.1 shows the number of cases as they were reported per offence and in relation to the variables. Table 4.2 shows the percentages of cases per variable.

A total of 226 cases were reported, including serious and minor offences. These include multiple offence reporting. Out of these cases, 140 were reported by males and 86 by females. As far as the academic standard of those victims who reported cases is concerned, 51 cases were reported by elementary-educated victims while 151 cases were reported by secondary-educated victims. The remaining 24 cases were reported by university-educated victims. With regard to the displacement of the victims, 82 were refugees and 144 were non-refugees. As far as the marital status of the victims is concerned 114 were married and 112 were single. In relation to the residence of the victims, 183 were urban residents and 43 rural residents. The B.C.S. (1983) shows only 9% reporting of crime from rural area. With reference to the ages of the victims, it shows that 116 were from the 15-29 year-old age group, 73 were from the 30-44 year-old age group and 37 from the 45-60 year-old age group.

In relation to the proportion of the sexes, males are disproportionately represented in victimisation, i.e. more males fell victims of a case of crime in relation to their representation in society. In conclusion, more males fell victims of crime than females. The difference between the sexes as far as victims are concerned is in the region of 23.8%.

As far as the academic standards of the victims are concerned, most of them were secondary-educated.

Having studied the variables of Tables 4.1 and 4.2 it shows that in terms of majority of factors, the victims are males, secondary-educated, non-refugees, married, urbanized

and have an age of about 15-29 years old.

Before going through the rates of proportion of victimization per demographic variable, it is necessary to present the general picture of victimization without taking into consideration any demographic variables (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). Generally speaking, it is shown that the highest number of reported cases per offence relate to crimes of theft of property from outside the house. Then in a sequence with less frequency: theft of items and parts from motorcycles, thefts of items and parts from automobiles, threatening behaviour, attempts to break into houses, theft from a person, criminal damage, burglary, trespassing, use of violence, attempt to use violence, thefts, thefts in general, attempts of thefts in general, thefts of motorcycles and bicycles, and finally attempts to break into automobiles.

Comparing the proportions of victimization per sex, it shows that both sexes have indicated that their major form of victimization is theft from outside the house.

Comparing the proportions of victimization of all three academic groups, it shows that there is great variation as far as emphasis of victimization is concerned. Elementary-educated victims reported mostly offences in the lines of theft of property from outside the house as well as threatening behaviour and theft of parts and items from an automobile. Secondary-educated victims reported mostly offences in the lines of theft of items and parts from a motorcycle or bicycle, as well as theft of property from outside the house and threatening behaviour. As far as the university-educated victims are concerned, the most frequent form of cases reported relate to thefts of parts and items from an automobile, theft of property from outside the house and criminal damage.

With reference to the less frequent number of reported cases it seems that for elementary-educated victims these

are: use of violent behaviour, bodily harm, attempt to use violent behaviour, attempt to steal from a person and theft of a motorcycle or bicycle. As far as university, educated victims are concerned, the less frequent reported number of cases reported are: attempt to use physical violence, bodily harm, threatening behaviour, attempt to steal from a person, theft in general, attempt to break into an automobile, theft of a motorcycle or bicycle.

Comparing the displaced and non-displaced population, I find that the majority of victimization cases among the refugees include cases for: theft of parts or items from an automobile, theft of property from outside the house and theft of parts or items from a motorcycle or bicycle. As far as victimization cases for non refugees are concerned, the majority of cases involve theft of property from outside the house and theft of parts and items from motorcycle or bicycle. The least reported victimization cases among the refugee population include theft of motorcycle or bicycle, theft of property in general and attempt to steal property in general. As far as the least reported victimization cases among the non-refugee population are concerned, I find that they include an attempt to steal from a person, attempt to break into an automobile, attempt to steal property in general and finally theft of a motorcycle or bicycle.

Comparing the marital status of victims per offence, it seems that the three major forms of victimization for married subjects are: theft from outside the house, theft of parts or items from an automobile and theft of parts or items from a motorcycle or bicycle, while the three major forms of victimization for single subjects are: theft of parts or items from a motorcycle or bicycle, threatening behaviour and theft of property from outside the house. The least number of cases reported per offence group for married victims are: theft of a motorcycle or bicycle, use

of violent behaviour or bodily harm, attempt to break into an automobile and attempt to use physical violence. The least number of cases reported per offence for single victims are: attempt to steal from a person, attempt to break into an automobile and attempt to steal in general.

Comparing urban and rural respondents in terms of victimization, it shows that for urban residents the most frequent forms of victimization are: theft of parts or items from a motorcycle or bicycle, theft of property from outside the house and threatening behaviour, while for rural residents the most frequent forms of victimization are: theft of property from outside the house, theft of parts or items from an automobile and attempt to enter premises illegally. The least number of cases reported per offence for urban victims are: theft of a motorcycle or bicycle, attempt to break into an automobile and attempt to steal from a person. The least number of cases reported for rural victims are: attempt to steal from a person, attempt to steal in general, attempt to break into an automobile and criminal damage.

Comparing the extent of victimization per age group, it shows that the highest proportions of cases reported for the 15-29 year olds are for offences related to theft of parts or items from a motorcycle or bicycle, threatening behaviour and theft of property from outside the house, for the 30-44 year olds are for offences related to theft of property from outside the house, theft of parts and items from an automobile and burglary, for the 45-60 year olds are for offences related to theft of property from outside the house, theft from the person and attempt to break into a house. The lowest proportion of victimization per age group are for the 15-29 year olds, attempt to steal from a person, attempt to break into an automobile and burglary, for the 30-44 year olds, theft from the person, attempt to steal from a person and theft of a motorcycle or bicycle,

for the 45-60 year olds attempt, to use violent behaviour, theft of a motorcycle or bicycle.

4.3 FORMS OF VICTIMIZATION REPORTED ACCORDING TO CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS.

Table 4.4 presents the forms of victimization of all cases reported from all areas of Nicosia. Taking one offence at a time, it shows that as far as burglary is concerned, the items stolen relate to bicycles, money and various other items. With reference to the use of violence, it seems that this was in furtherance of a fight. As far as threatening is concerned, cases show that this is the result of either argument or quarrel. With reference to theft of property from outside the house, it shows that theft of flower pots and flowers are the most common items stolen plus clothes from washing lines. Then follows theft of tools, clothes and garden chairs. As far as the offences relating to theft from the person are concerned, it is shown that the most frequent form of victimization is that of stealing money. In sequence, the same can be said about the attempt to steal from the person. With reference to theft and attempt to steal in general I do not see any likely form of frequency of victimization. It must be noted that no cases of theft of an automobile was reported. However, with reference to theft of parts or items from an automobile, I find that the theft of petrol, spot lights, rear mirrors and tape cassettes are the most frequent forms of victimization reported. In relation to the theft of motorcycles and bicycles, I see that both items have the same frequency of victimization. As far as theft of parts or items from motorcycles and bicycles is concerned, it is shown that the theft of spot lights, rear mirrors, petrol, aerials and sunglasses are the most frequent forms of victimization reported. Finally, with reference to criminal damage, I find that the property mostly damaged is

the automobile.

The study of the detailed tables in the appendix will show a distinction, of the extent of victimization in relation to urban and rural areas. The tables show that victims from the urban areas reported forms of victimization which relate to the theft of parts or items from automobiles and theft of parts or items from motorcycles or bicycles as well as criminal damage and theft or attempt to steal from a person. In addition, urban victims reported forms of victimization referring to burglary, theft in general and some specifically pointed to the theft of property from outside the house, namely petrol, clothes, tools and bicycles. With reference to rural forms of victimization, I find that these are distinctively different from those mentioned for urban victims. The most frequent forms of victimization in rural areas are those relating to the theft of property from outside the house, namely the theft of flower pots, flowers, tools, and garden chairs.

4.4 VICTIMIZATION CONSIDERED AS CRIME AND REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES.

In this section of chapter four the respondents were asked to indicate whether a) they have suffered a criminal victimization in general or b) whether they have seen anything considered as crime, or c) whether a member of their family has been a victim within the last year or d) whether any member of their family fell victim of a crime irrelevant to the extent of the time of occurrence.

This section varies from the first section of chapter four in the sense that it does not prompt the respondents for answer (suggesting to the respondents specific forms of victimization, note questions 1 to 14 in the part of the questionnaire for victimization). This procedure mainly involves the enquiry through the method of free recall. In

essence this section of the questionnaire will give an idea as to how much of the reported victimization is:

- a) Considered serious crime.
- b) How much of it is reported
- c) What kind of crime is reported
- d) The reasons for not reporting crime.

It must be noted that the above assumptions are with reference to what has been reported in section 4.2 which relates to victimization cases considered as criminal and reported to the authorities by the victims. Before making any detailed comparisons of the two forms of data, it is worth pointing out to the fact that these values are "raw" (in other words they did not receive any treatment in order to make them comparable with official criminal statistics).

It must be understood that these values include offences termed as serious and not serious. In addition, these values include offences which might have been defined as faults or as "no case" in police terminology. It is possible that respondents might have exaggerated their victimization. It is also possible that two or more respondents might have referred to the same offence.

As a researcher in criminality, I am aware of such obstacles in the methodology of such studies. Not all obstacles can be overcome because as in all cases researchers rely on the sincerity and maturity of the respondents to respond objectively. All victimization surveys indicate, that there is a degree of error concerning the credibility of responses which is unavoidable.

Tables 4.5, 4.5a, 4.6, 4.6a, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 present total values per variable for all locations of the survey except for that of Ayios Pavlos because the respondents from this area did not give a response to this specific question. The "no response" by respondents from the area of Ayios Pavlos indicates that none of those cases

reported in section 1 of chapter 4 were considered as serious crime. Tables 4.5, 4.5a and 4.7 show that, in total, 82 victimization cases were considered serious by the respondents who took part in the questionnaire. The above cases were reported by an equal number of victims. Of those victims, 53 were males, a 64.6% proportion and the remaining 29, a 35.4% proportion, were females. As far as the academic standard of those victims who reported victimization cases is concerned, 25 were elementary educated, a 30.5% proportion, 48 were secondary-educated, a 58.5% proportion and 9 were university-educated, a 11% proportion. Referring to whether the victims were displaced or not, 37 of the victims were refugees, a proportion of 45.1%, while the remaining 54.9% were non-refugees. As far as the marital status of the victims is concerned, 43 were married, a proportion of 52.4%, while the remaining 39, a proportion of 47.6%, were single. With reference to urban and rural victims, 61 were residents of urban areas, a 74.4% proportion, and 11 or 25.6% from rural areas.

4.5 REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING VICTIMIZATION TO THE POLICE.

The proportion of cases, which have not been reported to the authorities, is equal to 67.2% - Tables 4.6, 4.6a. The above value is raw and has not received any treatment. The above figure will be broken down later on in another chapter.

The main reason for not reporting the respective cases of criminality to the authorities is that: the majority of respondents have considered the case as not serious, and assumed that there was no need to report. The proportion of such explanation comes to 38.2% of all answers given for not reporting. This suggests a kind of tolerance by the Cypriots, in accepting situations, while others might term

them as crime. The second most frequent explanation given by victims, relates to the assumption that the case was a private matter and there was no need to involve outsiders. The proportion for such explanation is 16.4% of all answers. This endorses previous statements about the Cypriot's intentions for not wishing the police to interfere. A proportion of 14.5% of all answers refer to explanations other than the one's mentioned in the questionnaire. Such explanations are in accordance with the suggestion that respondents might have lost property rather than stolen, and also the respondents claim that they have dealt with the case personally. Another 10.9% of the answers refer to the claim that the police would have done nothing to solve their case of victimization. It must be noted that 7.3% of the victims refused to give an answer. The other explanation given by victims for not reporting their victimization to the police relates to the opinion that: the police would not have responded to the call 3.6%. This figure does not correlate with the figure presented in an earlier chapter, i.e. the Cypriots expect the police to respond immediately to an emergency. Other reasons include, a) the case was a private issue, b) fear of revenge by the offender, c) the police was already there, and d) combination of the above reasons. With what has already been said, I am in a position to make the assumption that, generally people in Cyprus do not report their victimization to the police because they believe that their case was not serious.

Question number 16 of the questionnaire shows that the majority of the respondents that have witnessed cases of victimization or cases of criminality were, 22 males out of a total number of 27 sightings, a proportion of 81.5%. The females have a proportion of 18.5%. It is shown that only 8 cases were reported to the authorities as opposed to 19 cases which were not reported. The proportions of

reporting is 29.6% and for not reporting 70.4%. The reasons respondents gave for not reporting the cases to the authorities were: (a) Did not want to get involved. (b) Have considered that the police would have done nothing. (c) Fear of revenge from the offender. (d) Other reasons. (e) The case was considered as not serious. (f) The police were already there. (g) Combination of the above reasons. A further 5.3% of the respondents refused to give an answer as to why they did not report the case of crime to the authorities. The general conclusion of question number 16 is that witnesses would not report criminality cases to the authorities mainly because they do not want to get involved. This endorses what has been stated earlier on, on the social behaviour of the Cypriots in not wishing to interfere in other people's affairs.

With reference to question number 17 which refers to whether a member of the respondent's family has fallen a victim of a criminal act, it is shown that only 12 cases of victimization were reported. Eight cases were reported by males and 4 by females. Out of 12 cases of victimization reported, a total of 9 cases were reported to the authorities and the remaining 3 were not. The main reason given for not reporting the cases to the authorities was that the police might have not responded to the call. Another subject refused to give an answer as to why he did not report the case to the authorities.

The above results are interesting because there is some form of contradiction in responses. For instance why victims will not report victimization while witnesses of crime report victimization. I will discuss this issue in section 4.6 of this chapter.

Question number 18 of the questionnaire investigates reporting of victimization of a member of the respondents' family irrelevant to the period of occurrence of an event. Results show that only 6 cases of victimization were

reported. Three cases were reported by males and 3 by females. All 6 cases were reported to the authorities.

4.6 DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided mainly into the following sections:

- a) Presentation of the number of cases of victimization occurred within the last year and reported to this survey.
- b) Description of the above cases reported to this survey.
- c) Victimization considered as crime by victims, witnesses and relatives of victims, which is reported to the authorities.

It has to be mentioned that this study does not take into consideration multiple victimization. The figures of crime presented in this chapter account for an equal number of victims. Because the survey was conducted in the district of Nicosia (which includes the capital city of Nicosia), any generalization of victimisation ratio for the whole of Cyprus is an error on account that location variations favour more serious crime in the main cities. Wolf and Hauge (1975) noted some inter-urban differences in Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden where the risk of falling a victim to violent crimes is greater in the capital city.

I find that the majority of cases reported refer to the "theft of property from outside the house". These include the theft of flowers, clothes from the washing line, flower pots, tools as well as garden chairs, petrol and bicycles. There is a certain parallelism with victimization in England and Wales when items not really secured in or outside the house are easily stolen. Such items include milk bottles and even the occasional theft of the garden tools. The essence of this point is that property which is left unattended mostly in front gardens is easily taken away. The difference between Cyprus and

England and Wales lies in the fact that people in either country keep different items in their gardens, which offer greater opportunity for thieves to steal.

The second most frequent form of victimization relates to offences based on "theft of parts and items from motor bikes". The majority of these offences include the theft of sunglasses, spot lights, rear mirrors, petrol and aerials. Really it is no surprise to find that the "theft of items and parts from motorbikes" has so much frequency. Bikes in general are considered as items belonging to a high risk category as far as damage or theft is concerned on account that securing these types of property is a bit difficult. Often bikes are left unattended in streets or front gardens or backyards where they offer ample opportunities to offenders to steal or damage them. The above explanations are true for both Cyprus as well as England and Wales, or, indeed, any other part of the world. Furthermore, it is also true to speculate that these types of offences would have a high dark figure of crime on account that owners of bikes would consider that partly they are to blame for not securing properly their property. Therefore, there is no need to report. In addition, they might consider that the value of their property which was stolen or damaged is not worth the effort of reporting to the police. Indeed some of these items have a low price value which suggests that owners might find it easier to replace rather than get involved with the police.

The third most frequent form of victimization reported to this survey refers to the "theft of parts or items from a motor vehicle". These parts and items include the theft of petrol, spot lights, tape cassettes, rear mirrors, wallets, clothes and even the occasional car tyre. It has to be mentioned that in the city of Nicosia, one finds a number of non-municipality owned or administered car parks which really do not provide enough security to vehicles.

In addition, poor street illumination during the night assists vandals to commit an offence (Painter 1989).

I do not believe that offenders steal parts and items from motor vehicles based on the assumption that these are not available in the market; quite the opposite, the Cypriot market has a high availability of spare parts and accessories for all major car types.

It is important to note that people in Cyprus, as it has already been mentioned, are relaxed and are not security conscious on the grounds that they do not see any real threat to their property. (An extended coverage on fear of crime will be presented in chapter seven) For this reason they leave their property unattended. Cars as well as front doors of houses are left open. If this was the case in England and Wales or a society dominated by anomie then perhaps this will give the opportunity ^{to} ~~of~~ offenders to call again for several reasons: a) The same offender returns, perhaps up on recognition of neglected crime opportunities or the anticipated reinstatement of goods; b) The first offender tells others of the house and what it still offers. The others then burgle it c) Features of the house are such as to mark it out as a compellingly attractive target to all those tempted to burgle it, leading to repeat victimization liked only by the seductiveness of the target (Polvi et al 1991). For this reason it is quite unthinkable in London for somebody to leave his front door open and go down the shops for half an hour or indeed leave the car keys on the car while he is indoors.

Therefore, security consciousness in a society plays an important role in deterring crime or at least offering opportunities to offenders to commit an offence. As far as opportunity to crime is concerned, Cohen and Cantor (1980) have associated life style and crime. Size of household constitutes a measure of guardianship (both of life and

property). It was suggested that single persons are less likely than members of large families to be accompanied out of doors, and less able to ensure that their dwelling is occupied when they themselves are absent. Therefore they are more vulnerable to crime. As it has already been stated, the Cypriots prefer to cohabit with their in-laws, parents or grown-up children. For this reason alone there is always somebody on guard to deter crime. On the other hand, Smith (1982) suggests that there is greater likelihood of victimization amongst residents from large households than amongst those belonging to small families. It is suggested that, because, large households imply the frequent entrance and exit by family members, and by a large assortment of friends and acquaintances, dwelling security is decreased and the range of potentially (if only rarely) risky relationships widened. The above would have been applicable to the Cypriot setting if it wasn't for the high acquaintancy rate, social norms and strong moral code which deter wrong-doing.

The fourth most frequent form of victimization refers to "threatening behaviour" Threatening behaviour has many meanings. Usually it refers to the intention by the person to harm another. Results show that threatening behaviour is the product of an argument or a quarrel. Some people in Europe will debate whether verbal threatening behaviour constitutes a crime. However, in Cyprus where morality is strictly controlled by the conservative social values, verbal threatening constitutes an insult to the family and to the individual. Not many people take threats for granted. In the past, threats were followed or met by criminal reaction. It is evident that people cannot swear or insult and not face a reaction.

Cypriots consider verbal threat highly, on account that this questions the manhood and domination of the victim's environment. For this reason Cypriots regard

verbal threat as a serious offence. In England and Wales residents consider threatening behaviour mostly when it is followed by physical evidence. Such offences include robberies when offenders carry an offensive weapon or in a furtherance of violent behaviour.

In essence, there is a misconception of the term "threatening behaviour". The Cypriots would consider an offence when somebody in a furtherance of an argument or a quarrel uses verbal threat. In Western countries this might not be the case because the social values of the society absorb such behaviour and in a way define it as misconduct rather than threat or offence. It is true that a threat is a threat, whether in Cyprus or England and Wales, but the point made above is that Cypriots have one conception of the term and Western people have another. This is so, because social values are not the same in both countries.

The fifth form of victimization considered very highly by the Cypriots is that which refers to "the attempt of illegal entry" and "Breaking an entry". It has to be made clear here that I am referring to offences other than burglary: to be precise, to offences such as trespassing or illegal entry. Really, in Cyprus not many such offences are going on or indeed reported in comparison with England and Wales, on account that Cypriots up to an extent tolerate trespassing. In close societies, neighbours are not expected to be considered as trespassers if they are found alone in the house or property. However, a stranger in the house is always given the benefit of the doubt because his intentions are not known. Besides, in societies such as that of Cyprus and specially in rural areas, most of the residents, are known to each other. The house owner will define a trespassing only when he finds in his property a stranger to the society. Therefore, a number of attempted breakings might be taking place but because the Cypriots do

not consider them as such they go unreported. With reference to the above, respondents will not even consider it as a crime and evidently not even report it to the crime survey. For this reason I assume that the extent of attempted breakings or trespassings is much higher than what is presented here. In the U.K., organized trespassers pose as officials in order to gain access in the house. I am afraid this type of trespassing is not evident in Cyprus. However, I predict that if somebody poses as a policeman he will have access to any house very easily. It is worth referring to national crime statistics in order to realize the extent of the reporting rate of "Attempting an entry". The 1985 Cyprus Crime Statistics show only 98 cases reported. If I was to project the cases reported in this survey I calculate around 1920 cases only in the district of Nicosia.

With reference to the above I believe that this has an effect on the level of reporting rates of burglaries. In England and Wales or in other countries where signs of anomie and disorganization dominate the society, even the next door neighbour might be accused of burglary if he is found in the house or property uninvited. At this stage, it is worth referring to burglaries and the characteristics that dominate such offences in Cyprus and England and Wales. This study shows that in Cyprus around 70% of offences considered in the first section (of the victimization part of the questionnaire) as burglaries were also termed as serious crimes.

In England and Wales it is shown that there are organized burglars who strike systematically. In Cyprus it is shown that there are some small gangs of burglars whose criminal life is short-lived on account that once they are detected they are totally destroyed. Often gangs are considered as "parees" (Peristianis 1966) friendship groups. Once the police arrests one member of the "parea",

it is easy to round up all other members of the gang. The detection rate of crimes in Cyprus is much higher than that of England and Wales. It stands to around 60% of the total number of cases reported to the police (excluding cases referred for the following year). For this reason gangs in Cyprus are eliminated very easily. Besides, Cyprus is a small place and the opportunity to change location or hit area by burglars or gangs is very difficult.

"In the United Kingdom the travelling criminal is one of the greatest problems facing the police. In Cyprus the insularity and integration of the communities do not offer much scope to the travelling criminal who is quickly recognized as a stranger" (Clifford 1954a p. 147).

It is worth describing the items burglars go for. This survey shows that in Cyprus burglars go for souvenirs, watches, wallets, household items, bicycles and money. There is a distinct pattern of items stolen. When the above items are compared with those preferred by burglars in England and Wales, they will show that there is a distinct difference. Burglars in big cities prefer to steal valuable items which can be easily disposed of and provide a quick gain. Such items include gold, silver, cameras, video, T.V., antiques as well as money. It is true to say that burglars will steal whatever valuable they find in the house or shop or office. In Cyprus burglars mostly do not go for T.V., video or cameras or china simply because not all households have these items to steal. In essence they will steal whatever they find in front of them. Besides, in Cyprus, evidences show that there are no organized receivers. Therefore, any products from the burglaries have to be disposed of individually which in any case is risky.

Other forms of victimization include "Criminal damage". Making a rough numerical estimation in Cyprus there are around 35 cases per 1000 households while in England and Wales 160 B.C.S. (1984) and 123 I.C.S. (1986). Distinctly, in Cyprus, there are fewer cases of criminal damage than in England and Wales. What are the main reasons which contribute to the low figures of criminal damage or vandalism in Cyprus? Firstly, Cyprus has no organized delinquents to go on the rampage after a football match, neither extreme political groups whose supporters will attack properties of minorities. The last sentence refers to racial attacks in London and other cities of the U.K.. Secondly Cyprus does not offer likely opportunities for offenders to commit vandalism or criminal damage. Cyprus has no run-down areas as described by those in London. It is documented that most of the vandalism that takes place in London or other big cities occurs in council estates or places where there is a mixed population, i.e. native and immigrant population. Thirdly, criminal damage occurs again for various reasons, mostly at places or areas where there is a conflict in the status of living of the residents. Generally speaking, Cyprus has no great differences between the various status of living. Working class residents do not differ much between them. There is of course a small elite class of people, but these are absorbed in the general class system. Some of these people have relatives from lower classes which really eliminates somehow the conflict between the classes. Cyprus unemployment stands at 3% whereas in England and Wales it stands at around 10%, and at some places 15%. For this reason class conflict is greater and more evident in the U.K. than in Cyprus. Criminal damage as well as vandalism is the result of this class conflict.

Other forms of victimization include "theft from the person" and "attempt of theft". It is worth noting that

some of these offences were reported by middle aged and older people. The majority of the items reported stolen refer to money. When comparing data, I note that in England and Wales the I.C.S. (1986) shows that there are 139 cases reported for the above offences while in Cyprus around, 35 per 1000 households. As a matter of definition, I am referring to theft from the person and not theft of personal items. Actually, when making a comparison of characteristics, I note that pickpocketing in certain areas of London is an art and a big headache for the metropolitan police. I also believe that pickpocketing in Britain is part of organized crime, i.e. it is evident that organized gangs of pickpockets prey on tourists and high street shoppers. It is not novel for foreign gangs to arrive in London with the sole purpose of stealing from people. Frequent publications in the media present cases of gangs from S. America and Europe arriving in London to hit at specific areas. It is interesting to show that in Cyprus there are some signs of foreign organized crime coming from neighbouring countries to hit Cypriot targets.

The issue of the travelling criminal was presented earlier on (Clifford 1954b). It is true to say that organized individuals arrive from neighbouring countries such as Greece, Turkey, the Lebanon, Syria, Israel, and Egypt merely to prey on Cypriots and tourists alike. A combination of the economic differential between two countries and attempts to impose various kinds of border controls can in some circumstances constitute an opportunity for criminal activity (Vagg 1992).

Concerning the above form of victimization, policing policies in England and Wales as well as Cyprus seem unable to deter or eliminate theft from the person, or, indeed, general theft because part of the criminal elements are introduced to the country from abroad. It is possible that stricter controls at the ports will deter criminals from

entering the country. However both Cyprus and Britain are attracting millions of tourists every year which really makes it difficult to screen every single one of them.

Another aspect to consider as far as "theft from the person " is concerned, is the fact that most of the people that reported cases of victimization in the survey were mainly old people. Therefore, I believe that perhaps one is not talking about theft but rather a misplacement. It is known that old people usually suffer from faulty memory and might not recall where they have placed their money or property. This should not outweigh the fact that old people are weak and vulnerable to victimization.

Other forms of victimization refer to the use of "violence" and "attempted use of violence". In a later chapter I will show that Cypriots prefer not to report victimization of violence because they believe that this is not an issue for the police. Indeed Cypriots prefer not to report to the police victimization, (mainly) assault, because they consider this a personal issue, which, if it is publicized, will bring shame and stigma to the victim. Social norms picture the Cypriot man having to fend for his manhood as well as for his family. Any assault on the man requires an honourable response. If the person cannot respond, then it is unlikely that he will report the case, because he will be ridiculed. For this reason, male victims do not report their cases of victimization.

It is interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of violence reported in this survey was by males. Out of 206 females taking part in this survey only one reported violent victimization. No one reported domestic violence. This contradicts Cretney et al (1994) who states:

"Those assault victims who do go to the police may be loath to commit themselves to the arrest and charge of their assailant. This is notoriously true of 'domestic' violence and we found ample reason why this should be so, where the police were called, the woman's most pressing need was usually for an immediate show of strength, either to remove the assailant from the scene or to deter him from further violence" (Cretney et al 1994 p.18).

Cretney (et al 1994) gives another explanation which is applicable to the current situation:

"A woman driver to seek police help may well be unable to see beyond her immediate need" (Cretney et al 1994 p.18).

Her immediate need is safety, revenge, and neutralizing fear. In the case of Cypriot society, the immediate need is to avoid the stigma which follows domestic violence. This by itself deters the involvement of the police. Domestic violence in Cyprus is an issue which will be discussed further on with reference to fear of crime. At this point, it is necessary to point out that housewives, as well as females, do not report victimization because social norms consider the women in second position, having to endure their husband's temper. McCabe and Sutcliffe (1978) summarize some of the reasons that force misconception of domestic violence in Britain. The same reasons can be applied in Cyprus. I consider that in Cyprus the majority of violences in general are not limited only to domestic violences. Neutralization theory suggests that when a delinquent act results in physical damage of a familiar victim such as wife, delinquents find this behaviour as impermissible as non-delinquent (Landsheer, Hart and Kox 1994). The neutralization theory not only neutralizes delinquency but has the same effect on the

definition of victimization. Sykes and Matza (1957) presented five types of neutralization, denial of the victim, denial of injury, denial of responsibility, condemnation of the condemners and appeal to the higher loyalty (Thurman 1984; Dodder's 1982; Mitchel et al 1990; Hollinjer 1991). Neutralization is one way in which the social defence mechanism tolerates crime for the sake of social order (People do not even dare to report their victimization to crime surveys). The reasons that contribute to this effect are:

- a) Family loyalty
- b) Social tolerance towards violence
- c) Not trusting the police

Statistically speaking, in Cyprus, there are 40 cases per 1000 residents reported while in England and Wales 186 (I.C.S. 1986). As far as gender is concerned the I.C.S. (1986) shows that 213 cases were reported by females per 1000 residents. In Cyprus the respective figure is around 2 reported cases. This does not mean that violence against women does not happen in Cyprus. It merely means that for various reasons these are not reported, even to crime surveys.

It is known that criminal tolerance varies from country to country, from community to community, and from victim to victim. In the case of Cyprus I believe that the level of tolerance is higher in comparison with England and Wales on account that this is institutionalized (note Durkheim's collective conscience) and not because of police suppression or indifference. For this reason alone, policing in Cyprus must take great consideration of public tolerance towards certain forms of victimization in case some members of the public fall victims of an institutionalized campaign against them (note victimization against the old and the women).

With reference to reporting offences, I have also

investigated the likelihood victims will consider their victimization as a serious offence. Seriousness of crime is a cognitive evaluation (Wolfgang et al 1985). Perception of crime seriousness involves two or more dimensions (Gottfredson et al 1988; Hansel 1987; How 1988; Sherman and Dowlde 1974). Seriousness is viewed as involving more than victim harm. The above are Uni-dimesnional characteristics (Schneider 1982), whereas the multi-dimensional characteristics are: more than one conceptual attribute (Forgas 1980; Gottfredson et al 1988; Hansel 1987; Howe 1988, Rahar and Teichman 1984; Sherman and Dowdle 1974; Shoham et al 1970). Intentionality and victim harm are the two primary dimensions (Forgans 1980 and Rahar 1980). The offender's characteristics are important determinants of crime seriousness judgement. Parton et al (1991) dispute anyhow as to whether there is a single scale where one registers magnitude of seriousness of crime and whether they will report their case to the police.

In a question I asked respondents to indicate criminal victimization that had occurred to them within the year before and also whether they had reported the case to the police or not (question 15). In the case where victimization had not been reported to the authorities, I asked as to what the reason had been for not having done so.

It is quite interesting to note that out of 226 cases reported to the survey (note questions 1-14 the victimization section) only 82 cases of the year before were considered as criminal. Out of these 82 cases only 33% were reported to the police. The I.C.S. (1986) shows that 50% of the cases reported to the survey were also reported to the police. This figure is by 17% bigger than that of Cyprus. However, if one considers the total number of cases of victimization reported in the Cypriot survey with the amount of offences reported to the police, one

will find that these came to only 12% (a significantly low figure). Furthermore, in chapters five and six I will explain the reasons why victims do not report to the police their cases of victimization. In Cyprus the low figure of police reported cases validates the issue suggested earlier on about the level of crime tolerance in the society as well as the definition of crime. In essence this accounts a great deal for the definition and the magnitude of crime. Considering also that it is up to the victim to come forward and report the case of victimization it makes them the number one agent responsible for the awareness of crime.

Table 4.11 Agencies detecting/reporting crime.

Cyprus Statistics

I.C.S.

H.M.S.O.No7

| | 1987 | 1986 | 1980 |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|
| | % | % | % |
| 1.Victims | 73 | 67 | 71 |
| 2.Relatives/Friends/ Other persons | 11 | 29 | 11 |
| 3.Police detection | 16 | 14 | 18 |

The above Table 4.11 shows that in Cyprus the police relies a great deal on victims coming forward and reporting a case of victimization. Clarke and Hough (1980) and, Heal and Morris (1985) showed that the police acting alone were unable to improve detection rates or to reduce crime. The police acting in collaboration with the community could sometimes reduce fear of crime or change public perceptions (Heal and Morris 1985; Pate et al 1986; Cordner 1986). Personally I believe that the above figures reflect a combination of methods of policing, criminal tolerance by

the public as well as the people's positive attitude as well as trust to the police. When studying the above figures I am able to formulate a hypothesis of crime awareness and policing policy.

It is true to speculate that if there is too much reporting by victims it signifies that either a) the police are acting only as a "fire brigade", b) the police have the respect of the people making it possible for victims to come forward and report victimization, c) the society itself cannot maintain social control and, therefore, all victims turn to the police for justice. On the other hand, it is true to speculate that when crime is mostly detected by the police, it signifies that either a) the police are oppressive and have agents everywhere b) the victims do not trust the police and therefore they do not contact them c) victims live in close societies where social control is maintained through the various networks of the society and there is a need by the police to enter these societies and enforce law and order, d) the police are so good they can be anywhere at any time, which is highly unlikely to happen.

In essence any future community policing theory must come up with a golden ratio between victims reporting a crime and police detecting crime. Concerning the above the concept "Liberty and Security" must be applicable to the situation so that justice may be distributed to all people equally.

In order to verify the above about criminal tolerance in Cyprus or England and Wales with reference to police reporting rates, it is necessary to find the explanations given by victims for not reporting their victimization to the authorities.

Briefly speaking, the majority of victims in Cyprus do not report their victimization to the police on account that they consider the offence as not serious, unlike the

I.C.S. (1986) 37.8%, which suggests that the majority of victims do not report to the authorities on account that it would not do any good. However, the majority of victims in the B.C.S. (Hagh and Mayhew 1985) 55% have indicated that they did not report their victimization because they have considered it as no loss and that it was too trivial. It seems there is a difference in the reasons given for not reporting an offence, not only between Cyprus and England and Wales but between different areas of Britain. This signifies that "no reporting" is a factor of many reasons. These reasons might include a) differences of policing policies from area to area b) differences in social values from area to area c) significant differences of people's attitudes towards the police. Besides, as I will present in chapter six, I will show that different victims have different reasons for not reporting an offence. A victim of violence will give different reasons for not reporting, in comparison to a victim of property offence.

Furthermore, in Cyprus 16% of the victims have indicated that they did not report to the police because they considered the case a personal matter. The second most frequent reason presented in the B.C.S. (1985) with 16% notes that victims did not report victimization on account that police would be unable to do anything. In addition, the I.C.S. with 26.2% suggests that the victims did not report victimization because the case was too trivial.

Studying the above reasons for not reporting victimization in Cyprus and England and Wales, I find distinct features for not doing so. In Cyprus victims do not report crime because they mostly believe that a case is not serious or because the case is a personal issue. In England and Wales on the other hand, victims believe that reporting will come to no good and because an offence is too trivial to bother the police with. I can speculate

that in the U.K., up to a certain extent, the police act as a repelling agent towards victims, (note reinforcement derived from the low clear-up rate) forcing them not to come forward and report victimization. Therefore, it is true to say that police positive reflexion plays an important role as far as crime reporting is concerned. In previous chapters it has been established that the Cypriot police force enjoys respect and positive attitudes by the public as opposed to the police force in England and Wales.

With reference to reporting a crime by witness or bystanders, data show that only 30% of them will consider reporting the case to the police. They will not report the offence because they fear the revenge and because police were already there.

But how significant is the above rate? How does it compare with other countries and what are the reasons to justify the above readings? "Oris" and "Amer" marketing research agencies have conducted a number of social awareness surveys in various European countries which in effect have answered some of the above questions (note Table 4.12).

The above table has a number of significant findings which will also be used in other chapters.

According to the Oris-Amer (1988) readings, Cyprus has the highest rate of people willing to report to the police an observed crime (this figure includes reporting by witnesses who happen to be relatives or friends). High reporting rates were also found by Maclean et al (1986) in I.C.S. In this current survey, comparison is not possible between the two surveys on account that relevant data on the issue of willingness to report a crime by an observer is not comparable.

When observing data from this survey with reference to reporting victimization of a relative (specific person) it will show that 75% of them have reported the case to the

police. This endorses Oris-Amer (1988) findings. A statement must be issued here in order to point that the Oris-Amer (1988) research refers (unspecified whether they are relatives or not) to witnesses in general while this point of the survey refers to reporting by relatives and friends. Perhaps the current issue requires further investigation in order to define why Cypriots report relatives' victimization to the police and do not report victimization of others. Already some reasons have been cited earlier in this chapter. These reasons include:

- a. Social Solidarity
- b. Concern for family suffering
- c. Wishing to get involved in the issue of social control
- d. It is easier to report to the police considering the high police density in the country. This means that some of the witnesses will be relatives of the policemen.

The last reason(d) is verified by the fact that when respondents were asked to indicate victimization of relatives more than one year before, all of the respondents who answered this question indicated that they had reported the case to the police. Because only 6 respondents answered this question, (a small number) it presents some problems in the validation of the previous arguments concerning reporting victimization of relatives.

It is a surprise though, to find only 6 respondents reporting victimization of relatives for more than a year before to the police, while for the last year alone there were 9 respondents. It is assumed that loss of memory contributes to the low recall rate. It is also true to say that there is a reciprocate relationship between time and recalling events. This factor is a major problem for surveys because it puts a question mark on the validity of the data obtained from free recall.

Further research must establish whether friends and

relatives are more willing to report victimization of their own kin rather than strangers. It is crucial to answer this question because when developing a community policing argument (or where victims are prevented from reporting crime themselves, on a number of social reasons), it is necessary to investigate the proportions of that victimization which will be reported by friends or relatives. Perhaps instead of talking about the extent of anomie as well as social conflict in the country, it is necessary to talk about the extent of altruism in the country.

I can speculate that in Cyprus people report victimization of others based on their altruistic feelings which are evident in social norms and kinship. On the other hand maybe in England and Wales the people report victimization of others because of the anonymity of witnesses. In effect this makes the police the "Big Brother" responsible for maintaining order.

Footnote:

As a matter of interest Cypriot Criminal Statistics No15 (1988) p.44 present data which show that as far as serious crime is concerned, relatives report only 3.2% of the cases, friends 0.5%, other persons 10.3%, police 10% and finally victims 75.9%. The above results contradict earlier statements. However, detailed observation of the above table will show that crime reported by others refer mostly to property offenses such as "Stolen" as well as "Criminal damage". In essence, cases where the victims could not be a person but instead companies and organisations (Kiosks, public transportation, public toilets, government buildings etc). Therefore, the opinion that relatives prefer to report victimisation of their kin is maintained. I suggest that this is one issue which requires further research in order to establish a valid reading.

Tables of Chapter Four

Table 4.1 Total number of cases reported per variable and offence.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED REF. NON | MARIT.ST. MAR. SIN. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | | |
|---|-------|----|-----------|-----|-----------------------|------------------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | | U | | | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| BASE | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | | | | |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 3 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 7 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 3. Burglary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | | |
| 4. Use of violence | 7 | 1 | | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 6 | 3 | | 9 | | 4 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 1 | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 15 | 7 | 6 | 16 | | 8 | 14 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 5 | 3 | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 23 | 20 | 16 | 23 | 4 | 15 | 27 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 21 | 8 | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 10 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 9 | | 6 | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 | | |
| 10. Theft in general | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | 22 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 3 | | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 20 | 11 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 9 | 22 | 22 | 2 | 24 | 6 | 1 | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | 13 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 8 | | 9 | 4 | 2 | | |
| TOTAL | 140 | 86 | 51 | 151 | 24 | 82 | 144 | 114 | 43 | 116 | 73 | 37 | | |

Table 4.2 Total number of cases (percentages) reported per variable and offence in relation to the total number of cases reported.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|---|-------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|------------|-------------------|------|------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | ST. SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | | |
| BASE | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | | (430) | | | |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 2.2 | 8.1 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 7.0 | 3.4 | 6.8 | 2.7 |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 5.0 | 10.5 | 9.8 | 6.5 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 8.3 | 5.3 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 9.3 | 7.8 | 4.0 | 10.8 |
| 3. Burglary | 2.9 | 8.1 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 5.6 | 3.5 | 6.3 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 9.6 | 5.4 |
| 4. Use Of violence | 5.0 | 1.2 | | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 5.2 | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 4.3 | 3.5 | | 6.0 | | 4.9 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 1.4 | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 16.4 | 23.3 | 31.5 | 15.2 | 16.6 | 18.3 | 19.4 | 28.1 | 9.8 | 15.3 | 34.8 | 12.0 | 28.8 | 21.6 |
| 8. Theft from the person | 7.1 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 6.0 | 8.3 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 2.3 | 7.8 | | 16.2 |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 2.2 | | 3.9 | 0.7 | | 3.7 | | 2.6 | | 1.6 | | | | 8.1 |
| 10. Theft in general | 1.4 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 2.6 | | 1.2 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 5.5 | 2.7 |
| 11. Attempt in general | 1.4 | 2.3 | | 2.0 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 2.2 | | 1.7 | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| 12a. Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | 15.7 | 7.0 | 11.8 | 9.3 | 33.3 | 19.4 | 8.3 | 17.5 | 7.1 | 11.5 | 16.2 | 9.5 | 19.2 | 8.1 |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | 1.4 | | 3.9 | | | 2.4 | | 1.8 | | 1.1 | | | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | 0.7 | 2.3 | | 2.0 | | | 2.1 | | 2.7 | 0.5 | 4.7 | 2.6 | | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 14.3 | 12.8 | 3.9 | 17.9 | 8.3 | 11.0 | 15.3 | 7.9 | 19.6 | 15.8 | 4.7 | 20.7 | 8.2 | 2.7 |
| 14. Criminal damage | 9.3 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 12.5 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 8.2 | | 7.8 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Table 4.3 Total number of cases (percentages) reported per variable and offence in relation to the number of respondents.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED REF. NON | MARIT.ST. MAR. SIN. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-----------|-------|------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | | | |
| BASE | (224) | (206) | (185) | (206) | (39) | (144) | (286) | (297) | (133) | (289) | (141) | (144) | (125) | (161) |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 1.3 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 0.6 |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 3.1 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 7.5 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 6.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 |
| 3. Burglary | 1.8 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| 4. Use Of violence | 3.1 | 0.5 | | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 2.7 | 1.5 | | 4.4 | | 2.8 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 0.8 | |
| 6. Threatening | 6.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 7.8 | | 5.6 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 10.5 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 9.8 | 4.0 | 1.8 |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 10.3 | 9.7 | 7.8 | 11.2 | 10.3 | 10.4 | 9.4 | 10.8 | 8.3 | 9.7 | 10.6 | 9.8 | 16.8 | 5.0 |
| 8. Theft from the person | 4.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 6.3 | | 3.7 |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 1.3 | | 1.1 | 0.5 | | 2.1 | | 1.0 | | 1.0 | | | | 1.8 |
| 10. Theft in general | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.9 | | 0.7 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 0.6 |
| 11. Attempt in general | 0.9 | 1.0 | | 1.5 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.4 | | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 9.8 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 6.8 | 20.5 | 11.1 | 4.2 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 11.2 | 1.8 |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | 0.9 | | 1.1 | | | 1.4 | | 0.7 | | 0.7 | | | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | 0.5 | 1.0 | | 1.5 | | | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 8.9 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 13.1 | 5.2 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 3.0 | 16.5 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 16.7 | 4.8 | 0.6 |
| 14. Criminal damage | 5.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 7.7 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 5.2 | | 6.3 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
| TOTAL | 62.5 | 41.8 | 26.8 | 73.6 | 61.9 | 57.2 | 49.7 | 38.5 | 82.0 | 63.2 | 30.3 | 81.0 | 58.4 | 22.6 |

Table 4.4 Forms of victimization as it was reported by all victims that reported cases on victimization

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use Of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from outside the house
8. Theft from the person
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items from car
- 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
14. Criminal damage

Souvenir, watch, wallet, mat, bicycle 3, money, flower pots.
 Fight.
 Football match, student riot.
 Argument, quarrel.
 Motor-bike, chairs, petrol, flowers 5, clothes outside the house 4, paints, bicycle, flower pots 14, tools 10.
 Jewellery, hat, money 10, tools.
 Handbag, money 3.
 Business, jewellery, fruit, watch.
 Stationery, money, copyright.
 Rear-mirror 2, money, cassettes 2, souvenir, from car
 various items 3, petrol 9, clothes, wallet, tape recorder, spot lights 4, tyres.
 Motor-bike, bicycle.
 Sunglasses 2, cassettes, battery, spot lights 8, from motor-bike
 basket, rear-mirror 4, petrol 4, bicycle 3, aerial 2.
 Car cover 2, damage letter box, car 10, spot light, various items.

Table 4.5 Total cases of crime reported including proportions and reasons of not reporting to the police

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|----|-----------|----|---|------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON. | MAR. | SIN. | URB. | RUR. | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| Victimization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | 53 | 29 | 25 | 48 | 9 | 37 | 45 | 43 | 39 | 61 | 21 | 39 | 25 | 18 | |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | 22 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 25 | 2 | 14 | 6 | 7 | |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | 8 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | | | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | |

Table 4.5a Total cases of crime reported including proportions and reasons of not reporting to the police

| POLICE REPORTING | | | | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|-----|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Victimization | YES | NO | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | 27 | 55 | | 21 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | 8 | 19 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | 9 | 3 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4.6 Total percentages of crime reported including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|------|------|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON. | MAR. | SIN. | URB. | RUR. | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| Victimization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | 64.6 | 35.4 | 30.5 | 58.5 | 11.0 | 45.1 | 54.9 | 52.4 | 47.6 | 47.4 | 25.6 | 47.6 | 30.5 | 21.9 | |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | 81.5 | 18.5 | 22.2 | 63.0 | 14.8 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 55.5 | 44.5 | 92.6 | 7.4 | 51.9 | 22.2 | 25.9 | |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | 66.7 | 33.3 | 22.0 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | 50.0 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 83.3 | | | 100 | 82.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 50.0 | |

Table 4.6a Total percentages of crime reported including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police

| | POLICE REPORTING | | | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------|-----|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|-----|------|------|
| Victimization | YES | NO | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | 32.9 | 67.2 | | 38.2 | 3.6 | 10.9 | 16.4 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | | 1.8 | 14.5 | 7.3 |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | 29.6 | 70.4 | | 10.5 | | 15.8 | | 21.0 | 15.8 | 10.5 | | 5.3 | 15.8 | 5.3 |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | 75.0 | 25.0 | | | 66.7 | | | | | | | | | 33.3 |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4.7 Number of cases considered as criminal by victims.

| | | Elementary | | | Secondary | | | REFUGEES | | | NON-REFUGEES | | | Secondary | | | University | | |
|----------------|--------|------------|---|-----|-----------|---|-----|----------|---|-----|--------------|---|-----|-----------|----|-----|------------|---|-----|
| | | Y | N | D/k | Y | N | D/k | Y | N | D/k | Y | N | D/k | Y | N | D/k | Y | N | D/k |
| 15-29 MALES | Urban | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 13 | | | 1 | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | 14 | | | 1 | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | | | | 3 | | | | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | | | |
| 30-44 MALES | Urban | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | Rural | | 2 | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | TOTAL | | 3 | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| | Rural | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 2 | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| 45-60 MALES | Urban | 4 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | Rural | 1 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 5 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | 9 | 8 | | 7 | 9 | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 6 | 26 | | 3 | 2 | |
| SEX | Male | 7 | 8 | | 2 | 6 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | 3 | 16 | | 2 | 2 | |
| | Female | 2 | | | 5 | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 | 10 | | 1 | | |
| AGE GROUPS | 15-29 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 19 | | 1 | | |
| | 30-44 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | 4 | 5 | | 1 | 2 | |
| | 45-60 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | |
| RESIDENCY | Urban | 6 | 6 | | 7 | 9 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 4 | 22 | | 3 | 1 | |
| | Rural | 3 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 4 | | | 1 | |

Table 4.8 Number of cases seen as criminal by respondents.

| | | Elementary | | | REFUGEES | | | NON-REFUGEES | | | Elementary | | | Secondary | | | University | | |
|-----------|--------|------------|---|-----|----------|---|-----|--------------|---|-----|------------|---|-----|-----------|---|-----|------------|---|-----|
| | | Y | N | D/K | Y | N | D/K | Y | N | D/K | Y | N | D/K | Y | N | D/K | Y | N | D/K |
| 15-29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Urban | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 4 | | | 1 | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 4 | | | 1 | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 30-44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Urban | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | 4 | 7 | | 1 | | |
| SEX | Male | 4 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | 3 | 7 | | 1 | | |
| | Female | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| AGE | 15-29 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 4 | | 1 | | |
| GROUPS | 30-44 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| | 45-60 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| RESIDENCY | Urban | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | 3 | 7 | | 1 | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |

Table 4.9 Number of victimization cases considered as criminal by members of the family.

| | | REFUGEES | | | | NON-REFUGEES | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------|------------|-----|-----------|-----|--------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | | Elementary | | Secondary | | Elementary | | Secondary | | Elementary | | Secondary | |
| | | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N |
| | | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K |
| 15-29 MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-44 MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-60 MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | Male | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Female | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGE GROUPS | 15-29 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 30-44 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RESIDENCY | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4.10 Number of victimization cases reported as criminal by members of family irrespective of time.

| | | REFUGEES | | NON-REFUGEES | | Elementary | | Secondary | | Elementary | | Secondary | | University | |
|-----------|--------|----------|-----|--------------|-----|------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-----|
| | | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N |
| | | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K | D/K |
| 15-29 | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FEMALES | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | Male | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Female | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AGE | 15-29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GROUPS | 30-44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 45-60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RESIDENCY | Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4.12 Social trends of behaviour in Cyprus and Europe.

Likelihood of respondings: at all occasions:

| | A | F | I | D | N | NL | E | CH | CY |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| 1. Report a driver leaving the scene of a serious crime | 70 | 70 | 73 | 72 | 86 | 83 | 68 | 72 | 95 |
| 2. Report an observed crime immediately to the police | 76 | 56 | 50 | 78 | 75 | 63 | 56 | 68 | 83 |
| 3. Report as a witness to an accident | 54 | 59 | 59 | 58 | 70 | 55 | 58 | 58 | 75 |
| 4. Work with someone who has served a long prison sentence | 21 | 34 | 44 | 27 | 45 | 24 | 38 | 53 | 29 |
| 5. Investigate a scream of an alarm in another house at night | 38 | 13 | 40 | 36 | 54 | 39 | 33 | 29 | 42 |
| 6. Help someone who is being unfairly treated by a policeman | 30 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 35 | 31 | 46 |
| 7. Get involved when you see someone shoplifting. | 31 | 15 | 15 | 23 | 63 | 24 | 23 | 19 | 51 |
| 8. Help a policeman who is in trouble | 17 | 18 | 42 | 16 | 33 | 30 | 44 | 16 | 59 |
| 9. Intervene between two people about to start fighting. | 16 | 9 | 24 | 9 | 24 | 7 | 27 | 10 | 33 |

A = Austria D = Germany NL = Netherlands

F = France N = Norway E = Spain

I = Italy CY = Cyprus CH = Switzerland

CHAPTER 5

UNREPORTED CRIME

5.1 SUMMARY

In this chapter emphasis will be given to unreported crime and the reasons why Cypriots do not report victimization. Mostly property victimization is not reported on account that cases are considered as not serious enough. Cypriots are also not likely to report personal as well as sexual offences on account that the society stigmatizes victims. This social norm deters victims from reporting victimization.

5.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF DARK FIGURE OF CRIME

Victimization Occurring within the Year Before.

With reference to the amount of crime reported to the authorities in general it is shown that 27 cases were reported as opposed to 55 which were not (note Tables 5.1, 5.2).

It is noted that 32.9% of the cases reported to this survey were actually reported to the authorities. In general it seems that the dark figure of crime in Cyprus is 67% of the total figure of crime in Cyprus. It must be noted that the above figure is a raw figure and it has not received any form of treatment.

From the above tables it is shown that among the male population that took part in the survey, there is less reporting compared to the female population that took part in the survey. The essence is that there is a slight difference as far as reporting is concerned between the two sexes. Although both sexes have a low reporting rate, this is somewhat greater in females than males.

It is noted that among the younger victims there is a

low figure of reporting in comparison with other age groups. The respective proportions are 25.6% for the age group 15-29 year old and 50% for the age group 45-60 year old. In essence the above tables suggest that older people report their victimization to the police twice more often than younger victims. The age group 30-44 year old have a proportion of reporting offences of 32%.

The above synoptic tables suggest that among the urban residents the reporting rate is higher than among the rural residents (Note that crime is denser in urban areas). The essence of the above tables is that among the rural victims there is an inclination not to report cases to the police (Note the existence of social defence mechanism in dealing with crime).

With reference to the variable of displacement, it seems that among the refugees the reporting rate is higher than that of non-refugees, almost three times as much.

As far as the academic level of those that reported cases to the police is concerned, it is shown that the highest proportion of reporting comes from the group of University-educated victims with a rate of more than fifty percent followed by elementary-educated victims with a rate of 36%. It is noted that university-educated victims report their victimization to the police more frequently than secondary and elementary-educated victims.

Witnessed Victimization Occurring within the Year Before.

When the respondents were asked to indicate whether they saw anything which might be considered as criminal, in all 27 subjects responded to the questionnaire by saying "Yes they had witnessed something" or were present when a crime was taking place. Of these 27 respondents (or shall I call them witnesses) only 8 of them called the police (a proportion of 29.6%) note Tables 5.3, 5.4.

In essence witnesses prefer not to report cases of crime to the authorities.

With reference to the difference in sexes of the reporting of the witnesses, it is shown that reporting is higher among the females than the males. It is evident that almost three times more females than males will report what they have witnessed.

The above tables show that witnesses having an age between 45-60 years old will report cases of crime to the authorities more frequently than witnesses from any other age group. It must be noted, however, that the majority of witnesses per age group will not report to the authorities cases of crime.

Only 2 witnesses from the rural residents have responded to this section of the enquiry. One reported the incident to the police while the other did not report it. For this reason I cannot draw a clear conclusion as to what amount of rural respondents will report cases of crime to the police. However, it must be pointed out that among the urban witnesses who responded to the questionnaire only 28% of them reported the events of criminality to the police.

When comparing the reporting rate of witnesses among the refugee and non-refugee respondents who took part in the survey, it will show that the majority of respondents did not feel willing to report the cases of criminality to the authorities. The tables also show that among the refugees there is a greater rate of reporting cases to the authorities than non-refugees.

As far as the academic standard is concerned for the witnesses who reported cases to the police, it is shown that none of the elementary-educated witnesses reported cases to the authorities. Due to the fact that not enough university-educated witnesses responded to the questionnaire, I cannot make an absolute case.

Reporting Relatives' Victimization Cases Occurring within the Year Before.

With reference to the reporting of victimization of members of the respondents' families, it is shown that 9 respondents out of 12 reported the cases of victimization to the police (note Tables 5.5, 5.6).

It seems that 75% of the victims' relatives reported the crime to the authorities.

The above tables suggest that the majority of males and the majority of females reported the victimization of their relatives.

With reference to the ages of the relatives of the victims who reported cases, most of the reporting has occurred among respondents of the age group 30-44 year olds. However, it is shown that equally there is a high rate of reporting from other age groups as well.

It is noted that there is more reporting among urban respondents than rural respondents. However, both urban and rural residents have a high rate of reporting.

The above tables suggest that reporting relatives' victimization is higher among refugees than non-refugees. However, it should be understood that due to the low figures, this limits credibility to the conclusion which can be drawn from them.

With respect to the academic standard of the relatives of the victims who reported cases, I find that there is a high rate of reporting from respondents of all academic standards. However, I find that secondary-educated relatives of the victims, present a rate of reporting somewhat higher than the other academic groups.

Relatives' Victimization Cases Occurring within an Unspecified Period

Having presented the interactions of variables covering the reporting of victimization of the respondents'

relatives within the year before, I continue the presentation with relatives' victimization within an unspecified period of time (note Tables 5.7 and 5.8).

I found out that males and females reported the cases of victimization to the police in equal proportions. The above tables show that all respondents from all ages reported the cases of victimization of their relatives to the police. It is noted that all respondents from the urban areas as well as rural areas have responded positively when it came to reporting victimization of relatives to the police. None of the refugees responded to this part of the enquiry. I cannot say with certainty whether there is high reporting among refugees or non-refugees. It is also shown that there is a high rate of reporting from all academic groups.

Concluding this part I would like to put a footnote: basically, to treat with caution the results presented in the above two sections referring to the reporting of victimization of a relative within the last year and unspecified time span on account that the figures are very small and do not hold any credibility in the face of differentiation of so many variables. However, I found it informative to present the results for future use and reference.

5.3 REPORTING VICTIMIZATION CASES

Reasons for Not Reporting Household Offences

In previous sections of chapter four I have presented the number of cases of victimization reported to this survey, compared to the cases considered as criminal and the number of cases reported to the authorities. In this section I am going a step further on by naming the offences of each category and how they were disposed by the victims' witnesses and relatives of victims.

Tables 5.9 and 5.10 show that, in all, 82 cases of

crime were reported. Although I am repeating myself it is necessary to present these figures once more in the context of offense reporting. As it has already been stated, 27 or 38.2% of the no reporting cases were not reported to the authorities on account that the cases mentioned were considered as not serious enough to stimulate the interest of the police. Another 9 cases were not reported to the authorities because people thought that the cases were a personal event needing no external involvement. Their proportion comes to 16.4%. Another 8 cases or 14.5% gave other reasons as to why they did not report their victimization to the police. Another 6 cases or 10.9% refer to the assumption that the police would have done nothing. Four respondents or 7.4% refused to give an explanation as to why they did not report their victimization to the authorities. Another 2 respondents or 3.6% indicated that they did not report their victimization to the police because they did not want to get involved. Other reasons include fear of revenge from the offender 1.8% and the presence of the police on the spot 1.8% a combination of the above reasons 1.8%.

Taking each group of offences in turn I find that, as far as property offences are concerned, 22 cases were reported to the authorities while 35 cases were not reported. The respective proportions are 38.6% and 61.4%. The majority of respondents did not report their victimization to the authorities because they assumed that the case was not serious enough (a proportion of 45.7%). Another 6 respondents said that they did not report their case of victimization because they assumed that the police would have done nothing (a proportion of 17.1%). Another 6 respondents or 17.1% gave other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire for not reporting their victimization to the authorities. Such reasons include:

- a) The victims dealt with the matter in their own

way.

- b) Forgot about the whole issue.
- c) The offender was known to the victim.
- d) The offender was a child or an old person.

Among the cases which refer to property offences four of them relate to theft in general i.e. thefts from shops, streets, businesses etc. These four cases were not reported to the authorities on account that the cases were not serious and because the victims assumed that the police would have done nothing. Another 1 subject refused to give an explanation as to why he did not report the case of victimization to the police.

Another 3 cases refer to theft of bicycles or motorbikes. All cases of victimization were reported to the authorities (a proportion of 100% reporting rate).

Another 13 cases of victimization that have been reported to the survey refer to burglary. Nine of these cases were reported to the authorities (a proportion of 69.2%) while the remaining 4, or a proportion of 30.8%, were not reported to the authorities. Half of the victims who did not report their victimization said that this was due to the assumption that the cases are not serious enough. The other half gave other reasons not included in the set answers of the questionnaire.

Two respondents reported attempts or breakings. Both cases of victimization were reported to the authorities.

With reference to the thefts of parts or items such as the ones mentioned in chapter four i.e. spot lights, rear mirror, petrol etc., I can see that in all 10 cases of victimization were reported to the survey and, only 2 cases or 20% of the cases were reported to the authorities, while the remaining 8 or 80% of the cases of victimization were not reported to the authorities. Three cases or 37.5% out of 8 were not reported on account that the victims thought that their victimization was not serious enough. Another

3 cases or 37.5% of the no-reporting cases did not give a specific answer as to why they did not report their victimization to the police.

As far as theft from the person is concerned it is shown that in all 6 cases of victimization were reported . Out of these cases of criminality only 1 case or 16.7% was reported to the authorities. The remaining 5 cases or 83.3% of the cases of victimization were not reported to the authorities. The reasons the victims gave for not reporting their victimization to the authorities referred to the consideration that the offence was not serious, 2 or 40%; the police would have done nothing 20%; did not want to get involved 10%; and other reasons 20%. I have to say that most of the victims who fell victims to theft from the person were old people.

With reference to theft of property from outside the house, the victims reported 8 cases of victimization. The cases refer to theft of flower pots, garden tools and garden chairs. Six cases or 75% were not reported on account that the respondents assumed that the offences were not serious enough in order to bother the police with a report. Another one case was not reported on the assumption that the police would have not responded. Another one case was not reported on account that the event was a private issue.

As far as criminal damage was concerned I found that 11 cases of victimization were reported. Of these eleven cases of crime only 6 cases or a proportion 45.4% were reported to the authorities. The remaining 5 cases or a proportion of 54.6% were not reported. The reasons for not reporting the offences to the authorities are in order of frequency: a) the police would have done nothing 50%, b) the offences were not serious enough, c) did not want to get involved, d) other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire. It must be noted that the offences of

criminal damage refer mainly to car damage.

Having presented the proportions of cases of victimization reported to the authorities and not reported with reference to property offences I am in a position to present the dark figures of the above group of offences.
Note Table 5.11

Table 5.11 Calculated proportion of crime not reported to the authorities for property offences.

| <u>Property Offences</u> | <u>Percentage of crime not reported to the authorities</u> |
|--|--|
| 1. Theft (unspecified) | 100.0%* |
| 2. Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 0% |
| 3. Burglary | 30.8% |
| 4. Attempting a break-in | 0% |
| 5. Theft of part or item from car | 80.0% |
| 6. Theft from a person | 83.3% |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house/shop | 100.0%* |
| 8. Criminal damage | 54.6% |
| Average total percentage | 61.4% |

* Statistical exaggeration

Reasons for Not Reporting Personal Offences

When presenting offences reported to this survey with reference to crimes against the person I find that altogether 18 cases of victimization were reported. Of these 18 cases of victimization only 3 cases were reported to the authorities (a proportion of 16.7%) while the remaining 15 cases, a proportion of 83.3% were not reported. The reasons given for not reporting these offences against the person were on account that the issue

was a personal matter 53.2% and that the offence was not serious 26.7%. The other reasons given for not reporting the victimization refer to the fact that the police were already on the scene of the crime 6.7%, other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire 6.7%, and 6.7% of the respondents refused to give an answer.

Taking each offence individually, it is shown that, as far as insult is concerned there, have been 4 cases reported in the survey of which only 1 case was reported to the police, a proportion of 25%. The remaining 3 cases or a proportion of 75% were not reported. Those cases that were not reported to the police were unreported on account that the victims considered the cases as not serious 33.3%, the police were already on the spot of the crime 33.3% and another 33.3% refused to give an explanation for not reporting.

As far as threatening behaviour is concerned, 5 cases were reported to this survey of which none was reported to the authorities. The reasons given for not reporting this form of victimization concerns the assumption made by the victims that these cases were a personal issue 80%. Another 20% refused to give an explanation as to why they did not report their victimization to the police.

With reference to violent behaviour, it is shown that there have been, in all, 9 cases reported to the survey. From these 9 cases only 2 cases or 22.2% were reported to the authorities, while the remaining 7 or 77.8% were not reported. The reasons given for not reporting these cases of victimization relate to the assumption that they were not serious, and to the belief that the cases were a personal matter needing no external involvement.

Having presented the number of cases reported to the authorities and cases not reported to the authorities with reference to offences against the person, it is possible to calculate the dark figure for each individual offence from

the group of offences related to crimes against the person.

Table 5.12 Calculated proportion of crime not reported to the authorities for personal offences.

| <u>Personal offences</u> | <u>Percentage of crime not reported to the authorities</u> |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Insult | 75.0% |
| 2. Threatening behaviour | 100.0%* |
| 3. Violent behaviour | 77.8% |
| 4. Sexual | 83.3% |
| Average total percentage | 83.3 |

* Statistical Exaggeration

With reference to sexual offences there have been only two cases of offences reported to this survey. Only one case was reported to the authorities. The other case of victimization was not reported, giving no reason why the case was not reported to the authorities. I cannot say with certainty that the above figures are representative of the total number of sexual offences because, as so many authors believe, very few respondents or indeed victims come forward to report their victimization. This is due to cultural stigmatization of victims. For this reason many authors accept that it is hard to estimate a number of total sexual offences. It is even (perhaps) harder in Cyprus, given the cultural barriers on sexuality, taboos, morality, ignorance, and fear. For this reason alone I suggest to place a big question mark on the issue of sexual offences in Cyprus.

Reasons for Not Reporting Other Notifiable Offences.

Concerning other notifiable offences, it is shown that 5 cases of victimization were reported to this survey. Of these cases only one case was reported to the authorities, a proportion of 20%. The remaining 4 cases or 80% were not reported. The reasons given for not reporting the offences relate to the assumption that the offence was not serious and fear of revenge from the offender. Another 2 victims or 50% of the cases refused to give any explanation as to why they did not report their victimization to the authorities.

With reference to traffic offences only 4 cases were reported to this survey. Only one case or 25% was reported to the authorities. The remaining 3 cases were not reported to the authorities. Two victims refused to give any explanation as to why they did not report their victimization to the police. One subject indicated that he did not report the case of victimization to the police on the assumption that the offense was not serious enough.

It is evident that only one case of gambling was reported to this survey. This case of victimization was not reported to the authorities and the reason given for not doing so relates to the fear of revenge from the offender.

Table 5.13 Calculated proportion of crime not reported to the other notifiable offences.

| Other notifiable offences | <u>Percentage of crime not reported to the authorities</u> |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Traffic | 75.0% |
| 2. Gambling | 100.0%* |
| Average total percentage | 80.0% |
| * Statistical Exaggeration | |

5.4 REPORTING CRIME BY WITNESSES

Reasons for Not Reporting Household Offences

This section deals with the proportions of reporting of offences by the witnesses and the reasons for not doing so. Note Tables 5.14, 5.15 . In all 27 cases of crime were witnessed by the subjects. Of these cases only 8 or 37% were reported to the authorities while the remaining 19 or 63% were not reported to the authorities. The reasons given for not reporting these offences by witnesses relate to the fact that they did not want to get involved 21%, the assumption that the police would have done nothing about it 15.8%, fear of revenge from the culprit 15.8%, thinking that the offence was not serious enough 10.5% and because the police were already on the scene 10.5%. One subject indicated a combination of all reasons mentioned in the questionnaire. Another 3 witnesses or 15.8% gave other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire. One respondent refused to give an explanation why he did not report what he had witnessed to the police.

With reference to property offences, in all, 9 cases were reported to this survey of which only 5 were reported to the police (a proportion of 55.6%). The remaining cases were not reported to the authorities. The main reasons for not reporting these cases to the authorities were due to the assumption that the police would have done nothing about it 50%, the witnesses did not want to get involved 25%, other reasons 25%.

As far as theft in general is concerned, there were 4 cases of crime reported by the witnesses. None of these cases were reported to the police. The main reasons for not doing so relate to the assumption that the police would have done nothing about it. The other reasons include the fact that the witnesses did not want to get involved. Another subject gave other reasons for not reporting what he had witnessed. One case of theft of a

bicycle/motorcycle was reported and this case was reported to the police by the witnesses.

One more case of theft of part or item from a car was reported and again this case was reported to the police by witnesses.

With reference to criminal damage, respondents witnessed 3 cases all of which were reported to the authorities.

Reasons for Not Reporting Personal Offences

With reference to offences against the person in general, it is shown that in all 10 cases were reported by witnesses (Tables 5.14 and 5.15).

Only 1 case or 10% was reported to the authorities while the remaining 9 cases or 90% were not reported to the police. The reasons given for not reporting these cases to the police were due to the fact that the witnesses did not want to get involved 20%, fear of revenge from the offender 20%, the police were already on the scene 20%, the case was considered as not serious 10%, the police would have done nothing 10% and other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire 10%.

One case of threatening behaviour was reported by witnesses. This case was not reported to the police on account that the witness did not want to get involved.

As far as violent behaviour is concerned, witnesses reported a total of 9 cases of which only 1 case was reported to the authorities. The remaining 8 cases were not reported to the police. The reasons given for not reporting these cases to the authorities were due to fear of revenge from the offender 25%, the police were already on the scene 25%, the case was considered as not serious 12.5%, did not want to get involved 12.5%, other reasons 12.5%.

Reasons for Not Reporting other Notifiable Offences.

With reference to other notifiable offences, there have been 8 cases of crime reported (Tables 5.14 and 5.15). Out of these 8 cases, only 2 were reported to the authorities, a proportion of 25%, while the remaining 6 cases or 74% were not reported to the authorities. The reasons for not reporting these cases vary significantly. One witness said that it was due to the assumption that the police would have done nothing, another one was because the witness did not want to get involved with the issue, one witness said that he did not report the offence because of a number of reasons i.e. a combination of the ones mentioned in the questionnaire, one witness gave other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire.

One subject witnessed a case of victimization of gambling. He did not report the case to the authorities, neither did he give a reason why he did not report the case to the police.

5.5 REPORTING RELATIVES' VICTIMIZATION CASES

Reasons for Not Reporting Household Offences

Concerning the reporting of victimization of the respondents' relatives only 12 cases were reported to this survey (Tables 5.16 and 5.17). Only 9 were reported to the authorities while the remaining 3 were not reported. The reasons given for not reporting them to the authorities were on the assumption that the police would not have responded (66.7%). Another subject refused to give an explanation.

As far as property offences are concerned, 10 cases were reported. Of these cases only 7 were reported by the relatives of the victims to the police. The remaining 3 cases were not reported. The main reason for not reporting relates to the assumption that the police would not have

responded.

Reasons for Not Reporting Personal Offences

Concerning offences against the person I find that the relatives of the victims reported only two cases to this survey (Tables 5.16 and 5.17). Both cases of crime were reported to the police. These cases relate to violent behaviour.

Reasons for Not Reporting Offences within an unspecified period

Finally, Tables 5.18 and 5.19 present the number of cases reported to this survey by the relatives of the victims irrespective of the time of occurrence of the event. It is shown that the relatives of the victims reported only 6 cases of which all cases were reported to the authorities.

The individual offences were: theft in general one case, theft of a bicycle/motorcycle one case, theft of part or items from an automobile one case, theft of property from outside the house 3 cases reported.

One aspect of Tables 5.18 and 5.19 is to compare these longitudinally with Tables 5.16 and 5.17 and arrive at to the conclusion that as time goes by, respondents find it harder to recall events that took place more than a year ago. In previous questions, however, the respondents were asked to recall criminal events that took place within the time limit of one year. In question 18 the respondents were given unlimited time span; thus affecting the respondents' memory. The earlier the period of recall of an event the better. Perhaps this is why respondents recalled more cases of criminality in question number 17 than 18, of the questionnaire.

Because only 6 cases were reported, I cannot draw any specific conclusion. However, it is interesting to note the

low reporting ratio and use this for future design of research: (it is evident that it is hard to recall events, especially victimization, for more than a year before).

5.6 AMOUNT OF VICTIMIZATION CONSIDERED AS CRIMINAL AND REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES

I must note that Table 5.20 summarizes all cases of victimization as they were reported by victims. It is evident that the older victims have a higher rate of reporting offences to the police than younger victims. It is noted that 24.3% of those cases that were reported to this survey as victimization were also reported to the authorities, as opposed to 8.6% of the younger victims. The other conclusion I draw, as far as reporting is concerned with reference to the variable in question, is that reporting is higher in university-educated respondents, in comparison to elementary and secondary-educated respondents. The proportion of reporting is 20.8% as opposed to 17.6% and 8.6% of the elementary and secondary-educated respectively. Another conclusion to be drawn from Table 5.20 is that refugees have a higher reporting rate than non-refugees. The figures are 22% and 6.3% respectively. In essence 22% of the cases of victimization were also reported to authorities by refugees as opposed to 6.3% reported by non-refugees. When comparing the variables of sexes, I do not find much difference on the reporting rates. Males have a 11.4% reporting rate while the females 12.8%. Although there is a difference in the two readings, this cannot be significant. The other variable left is that which deals with the residence of the victims. It is shown that rural victims have a higher reporting rate than urban victims. To be precise, 14% of the cases reported by victims from rural areas were also reported to the authorities while the representing figure for urban victims is only 11.5%.

Having presented the number of cases reported to the police as well as the number of cases not reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so, I have concluded chapter 5. Further on I will go one step ahead with this presentation by comparing the above mentioned results of this survey with those of the British crime survey of 1981 and other surveys, and find areas of difference, or similarities, which are affected either by policing method or cultural characteristics.

5.7 DISCUSSION

I will conclude the topic of unreported crime by giving reference to the various reasons the respondents gave for not reporting victimization to the authorities. By doing so, it is expected that I will come up with possible dark figures of crime on a number of offences.

In a way this chapter is a follow-up to the previous issue of victimization and some data will seem to be already presented or mentioned.

Before getting into the issue, I find it necessary to justify some obvious readings on previous Tables. For instance as I have already mentioned, only 33% of those victims that reported cases in the survey also reported cases to the authorities. The figure in the I.C.S. is around 50% and Smith (1983) pp 75 is 52%. It seems that in England and Wales the figure is standard. In theory Cypriots hold back when it comes to reporting victimization to the authorities. Some reasons for this effect have already been presented in the previous chapter and there is no need to repeat them. Another issue which appeared earlier, is the fact that some respondents might not be truthful in recalling victimization for specific offences on account of a number of reasons again already mentioned earlier on. All these issues suggest that the above

figures are not absolute and should be studied in the form of indicators. Specially the above tables show that, as far as variables are concerned, young people do not report to the authorities victimization with the same frequency as old people. There seems to be a tendency not to report victimization by youngsters. I can say the same to a certain extent for the rural population. Again, it is interesting to note that non-refugees have a high non-reporting rate.

The above variables portray no reporting behaviour on account of a number of reasons. In effect each variable has its own reasons. For example: The young people do not report victimization because, as research has shown and I have already mentioned in chapter 1, they are somewhat suspicious of the police. Their low level of acquaintance with the police as well as low level of satisfaction with police behaviour motivate the young people not to report victimization. Similar results were found in the I.C.S. (1986) as well as the Hammersmith and Fulham Crime and Policing Survey. The social significance of the above can be explained in terms of the syndrome of rebellion. All over the world the young people are characterized by their rebellious attitudes they have against the family as well as society in general. The police holds no exception.

The issue here is whether this negativism will change when these people grow up or whether it will continue. The question asked is whether really these people will be absorbed in the social structure and, therefore, conform to current social norms or whether their behaviour will dominate traditional norms. In the latter case, I imagine that there will be a change in the structure of society which will inevitably lead to a change in the implementation of social control. When predicting future development, I imagine that the young people will eventually conform to social norms giving place to the

next rebellious generation. Contemporary history of Cyprus shows that the youngsters have always been the initiators of social and political changes (note the 1930's uprising against the colonials, the 1950's demonstrations against British rule and the current demonstrations against the Turkish occupation). However, all the time the youngsters return to conform to family rule. Institutions such as "parees" "marriage" "koumpari"¹ etc. help to absorb and to change negative behaviour. The above development coincides with the transformation of the Hippies of the 60s and 70s to the professionals and businessmen of the 80s and 90s. There is a natural transformation from radicalism to ultra conservatism.

Another explanation for the young people's defiance of authority (because this is what their behaviour is translated into) is the fact that a large proportion of young people in Cyprus serve in the army and another large proportion studies abroad. The army is a hard place for a youngster of eighteen and twenty. This is an impressionable age and one can easily imprint defence mechanisms in order to outweigh subjection. One of these defence mechanisms includes defiance to authority. Defiance to authority is collective because the army life teaches conscripts to act like a Unit. One hates authority, all hate authority. It is later on when these people mature and enlist as reservists when collectiveness takes another form, that of conscientious preservation and security. The reservists regiments are maintained structurally by informal law and members of the group are not subject to external pressure to conform, when young reservists enter the regiment, then they willingly conform to the norms and laws. These informal norms and laws are related to cultural characteristics which initiate conformity i.e. collective

¹. group of best men to the groom

conscience.

Konis (1990) in a study referring to the young generation of Cyprus found that 71% of his sample indicated that young people did not agree with the values of their elders. This explains the negative attitudes youngsters have towards their elders. It follows that negative attitudes will also be directed towards authority: i.e. the police force, since it is formed by elders. On the other hand, the same study has shown that 73% of the sample indicated that youngsters respect their elders. Showing these results, I identify a certain conflict in the youngsters' mind. On the one hand youngsters are rebellious towards elders and on the other hand they respect them.

In terms of policing, this suggests that the youngsters are rebellious towards the police but at the same time they respect the authorities. The above is true as long as the identification between elders and policemen is maintained. Reporting victimization inevitably is a factor of this contradiction of attitudes young people have towards the police force.

Results also show that rural people do not report victimization in the same frequency as urban people. Although repeating myself, Attalides (1981) in "Social change and urbanization in Cyprus: A study of Nicosia", has indicated that kinship and social network in rural areas is stronger than urban areas. The same conclusion is also drawn by Markides (1978) "Lysi-Social change in a Cypriot village". As far as policing is concerned, the police are kept at a distance because these societies do not wish any external involvement in their affairs. Maurine Cain (1973) summarizes adequately the reasons for not reporting in rural England.

"The members of the community defined for him what was trivial and what was important, what was real police work and what was not" (Alderson 1979 p.187).

Rural areas are also defined by their conservative stand on social issues. Therefore an evaluation between urban and rural areas should in fact include differences in the values and moral. Community policing in Cyprus is inefficient in combating crime adequately, because society itself (be it the Cypriot society or the rural British society) does not wish to involve the authorities in their own affairs. However, any other form of policing could be suppressive and initiate a chain reactions to other problems which in effect will have a backlash on the social structure as well as the perception of the police.

Therefore, I can identify a form of proportionality between social values, policing methods and the amount of victimization reported. I can identify two extreme cases to support the above statement:

a) A community with strong social bonds policed by a friendly police force will lead to less victimization reported. On the other hand:

b) A community with fewer social bonds policed again by a friendly police force will lead to more victimization reported, (considering that in both cases, the amount of criminality is the same).

The difference lies in the fact that in condition (a) the community will prefer to solve its own problems while in situation (b) the community will refer matters to the police because there is nobody in their immediate environment to offer protection or justice.

The above points need clarification and expansion because of the involvement of numbers, factors which are involved in the situations. However, they give the incentives in order to support future research on the issue

of community policing with reference to social bonds, kinship, and the amount of crime reported.

The Cypriot refugees being willing to report victimization more frequently than non-displaced people give insight to the above argument. As I have already mentioned, displaced people have lost their natural social environment and were placed in artificial settings. All social chains relating to kinship and traditional social structure were destroyed. As a result social control cannot be maintained through the channels of kinship and association. Due to the social rupture, collectiveness is contradictory. The social contract cannot be maintained because the defence mechanism is mutated. As a consequence to all these, there is a conflict in morality (Durkheim). Inevitably, the refugees ask the authorities to enforce law and order because:

a) There is no social tolerance of victimization because there is nobody to enforce it.

b) There are no elements to uphold social control such as deterrence and prevention.

The above conclusions reinforce the argument that crime reporting is a factor of social tolerance based on social values and norms which are promoted by the organized family unit and exerted by kinship.

I expect that in time refugees will be assimilated socially through marriage or acquaintance with the rest of the population and initiate new chains of associations. This move will also have an effect on present social chains in the sense of weakening existing association. As a result, it is expected that the refugees will conform to traditional evaluations of the police while, on the other hand, non-displaced residents will adopt a certain skepticism about the police force. In essence there is going to be a shift. Refugees moving towards conformity and unification with the rest of the population, while non-

refugees will move towards the positions of the refugees. Because non-refugees are more than refugees, it is expected that the favourite evaluation of the police will override negative evaluations.

As far as reporting victimization by others such as witnesses, relatives, and friends is concerned, I find similar results with those found in the previous chapter.

As far as the sex difference is concerned, males are more inclined not to report victimization of others because of a number of reasons:

- a. Did not wish to get involved
- b. Fear of revenge
- c. The police would have done nothing.

The above reasons relate to the close society syndrome of Cyprus which states that every family looks after its own affairs. Informal family laws dictate that one should not get involved in other families' affairs.

It is important in any policing method to take into consideration the involvement of the public in crime reporting because this is one method of informing authorities about crime. For this reason the general public must feel confident that their involvement will benefit themselves and society in general. Also they must feel that their involvement has no social stigma which will outcast them from their social environment.

The police can assist this development by reinforcing and motivating people either with grades of merit or financial awards to those coming forward and reporting an offence. In addition, they can give social incentives recognized by the society, i.e. merits of conduct and prestige. In some serious cases though this might be impractical.

When studying the above tables, I observe that in summary 61% of all property offences were not reported to the authorities in comparison with 51% of the Hammersmith

and Fulham Police and Crime Study, 64% Merseyside (1981), 48% Policy Studies Institute London Survey (1983), 50% I.C.S. (1986). It is evident that Cyprus has one of the highest rates of non-reporting victimization as far as property offences are concerned.

There are many reasons here to explain these readings which are not entirely on account of good or bad policing. A simple explanation which carries credible weight suggests that in the U.K. most of the properties are insured. This is so because of the development of insurance companies and the demand to insure property. It is self explanatory that people will be motivated to report their victimization because without the police report the insurance companies will not pay the damages.

"All insurers are at risk of fraud perpetrated up on them by insured, that is, claims for indemnification to which they are not entitled. They may vary from limited exaggeration of the value of a claim which most insurers can negotiate in the course of claims verification and less adjustment, to the entirely bogus claim, where losses never really occur, and may also include falsification of the details of a real incident to qualify for cover"
(Clarke 1990 p.1).

"These appear to indicate an increasing recognition of the damage being done by insurance fraud but for a variety of reasons many companies are reluctant to take bold and public steps to combat fraud"
(Clarke 1989 p.1).

In Cyprus, however, the insurance companies are still at the stage of infancy. The B.C.S. (1983) has shown a 30%-45% rate of insurance for property offences while the I.C.S. (1986) shows a 61% rate. These are reasonably high figures. Although a large number of the population have personal insurance in Cyprus still they are opposing to pay

for a property insurance (Fire and Theft) because they really do not see any real need for it. In addition any victim of burglary or theft weighs up the pros and cons and finds whether the values of goods stolen or damaged are worth reporting to the authorities. If the people see that the value of the goods is not high and the damage is bearable then they do not report it. Another issue might suggest that victims could have been negligent of securing their own property. This also deters them from reporting property offences.

Therefore, reporting crime offences is not directly linked to policing methods because there are several schemes in the U.K. where victims can claim state or private compensation. There is, therefore, a tendency to report property victimization because there is a chance that victims will get the value of their property back. In Cyprus, though, private claims of compensation are not yet widely used, and therefore victims bear their property losses. This gives them incentives not to report offences because these will come to no use. It is significant to show that almost 50% of the property victims did not report their victimization because they thought the case was "not serious enough".

As far as personal offences are concerned, I find that in Cyprus almost 85% of all cases of victimization are not reported to the authorities, in comparison with 30%-40% in England and Wales. Already I have mentioned that Cypriots in their majority do not report victimization cases of personal offences on account that the victims have considered these as a "personal issue". McCabe and Sutcliffe (1978) summarize most of the reasons which in essence concentrate on domestic violence. As I have already mentioned, the Cypriot society consists of close units which interact with each other. Most of these families are based on the patrimonial structure and the

father figures exert domination on all members of the family. In the family there are unwritten rules that state that all members should obey the head (Peristianis 1966). Often violence will occur between males in the household challenging authority i.e. father and son, between father and mother, and between siblings. Often there is conflict between the neighbours if there is contradiction in values, social status and social class. This is more evident in refugee housing estates and some rundown areas of the suburbs in Nicosia. In 1985 I presented a report which refers to violence and conflict in refugee housing estates (Hadjidemetiou 1985). I investigated a number of Social Enquiry Reports (with the kind permission of the Welfare Office in Cyprus) and found that in the refugee housing estates there is more conflict as far as S.E.R. is concerned, than in other areas, as well as when comparing other offences.

In essence in R.H.E. there is more anomie and more social disorganization. Similar conditions are found in many areas of London, including council housing estates in Islington. I can go further than this by stating that refugees up to a certain extent portray more conflicting behaviour than non-refugees. As a result, refugees have an inclination to report more victimization because their social chains of kinship are loose and social control cannot be maintained through the usual social channels. Therefore, the refugees, not having anybody to maintain social control, rely mostly on the authorities to enforce law and order as well as justice.

Being an optimist, I believe that gradually the refugees will be assimilated with the rest of the population and will portray the same social behaviour as them, i.e. report less victimization cases. Not because there is going to be less crime but because they will be affected by collective conscience as far as social order is

concerned.

Therefore, I predict that, regardless of whether there is going to be an increase of personal offences, it is certain that less will be reported by the refugee population. However, in the long run, when social structure commences disintegrating and social values do not uphold social control, then, it is expected that more victimization cases will be reported.

As far as policing is concerned, it seems there is a limited role for the police in deterring personal offences. The police can, however, speed up or delay the process of social control by the degree of involvement it has in the social structure, more specifically, emphasizing its association with the family unit.

With reference to sexual offences, I cannot really make any objective evaluations on account of the small numbers of cases of victimization that have been reported in this survey. It is evident that not only the Cypriots but also people all over the world decline to report sexual victimization to the authorities. It is well known that many rapes are never reported to the police. No more than two-thirds are reported (Hindeland and Davis 1977); in contrast, only one-third are reported (Amir 1971); almost one in four cases are written off as "no crime" (Wright 1980). Furthermore, victims even refuse to report victimization to crime surveys. One cannot comfortably be asked to recall sexual victimization in an interview setting. However, when the methodology takes the victims' feelings more into consideration, then it is possible to register more sexual offences. In Cyprus evidence shows that it is harder for sexual victims to report victimization because:

- a) Society stigmatizes sexual victims
- b) Only 2% of the police force are women-constables (Police Report 1988).

a) I have already mentioned in an earlier chapter the extent of the social stigmatization sexual victims have to endure. Social stigmatization also labels the offender. It can be seen that there is a dual function of stigmatization: first on the victim and then on the offender. Each one for his/her own purpose does not wish to bring to the surface sexual crime. For this reason fewer cases of victimization are reported.

Recorded sexual offences in Cyprus occur mostly in the summer months, at the holiday resorts of Famagusta, Larnaca, Limassol and Paphos. Usually they involve foreign victims (Hadjidemetriou 1985).

In Cyprus there is no tourist police and in the above holiday resorts the police shows little presence in order not to create panic with its presence among the tourists. For this reason criminals find the opportunity to prey on tourists. Just for the record, every year about two million tourists visit Cyprus (almost three times the population of Cyprus). One can imagine the extent of influence this has on the structure of society. Further research is required in order to investigate the social changes caused by the influence of tourist industry on the Cypriots and mainly on social control. Already signs show an increase of divorce rates in these holiday resorts among the Cypriots. It will not be long before this will become a social problem.

It is evident that in the past youngsters used to abduct their beloved ones when the parents gave no consent to their marriage. As a consequence, there was an insinuation that the girl was raped. In order to avoid this unpleasant situation of stigma (nobody will be willing to marry the girl again) the parents gave their consent to the marriage. This phenomenon is not totally novel in contemporary Cyprus. In some cases the parents might go ahead and report. A scene from Romeo and Juliet will

adequately describe the above situation. A man entering a girl's room, kissing or sitting on the girl's bed was immediately considered a social offence and the right remedy was marriage in order not to give cause for rumours. In extreme cases the man would abduct the girl although she was not willing to marry him, and hide her in his house or another place (rape was not even considered). In such cases, although the police were informed about the abduction, no further criminal proceedings were carried because the police in their capacity as the social controller usually diffused the situation (which usually ended in marriage). Nobody wished to bring the matter to the surface in fear of stigmatization. I believe this goes on today in rural Cyprus, but to what extent, it is not known because of families not wishing to report for obvious reasons.

b) As far as police-woman density in Cyprus is concerned, it is evident that in 1988 there were 68 of them (Police Annual report 1988) mostly on clerical and other duties. For this reason the principle of acquaintance and policing is not evident, because there are no women constables around so that victims could feel comfortable to report their victimization. Because sexual victimization carries such a high rate of stigmatization, victims do not feel comfortable when it comes to reporting to a policeman. That is the reason why they are deterred from reporting.

If on the other hand, the density of women constables in Cyprus was greater then I believe the rate of reporting would be higher. Perhaps this is one reason why in England and Wales there is more sexual victimization reported. It is on record that in the U.K. female constables comprise 7-10% of the total police force. The increased presence of women in the police force makes it easy for victims to come forward and report victimization.

In essence I am not talking about policing the community with only socially orientated means but also to have a social representation of the people that make the society. Specifically, more women in the force will portray signs of confidence and security to women in order to come forward and report not only sexual offences but also domestic violence and any other offences against women.

As far as reporting miscellaneous offences to the police is concerned, the above tables show that 80% of victimization goes unreported. This is so because the number of offences mentioned in this survey is small, and therefore I believe any evaluation will not be objective.

Table 5.20 shows extensively the rate of dark figures of crime as a factor for the number of cases reported to this survey with reference to a number of demographic variables. Based upon the results of this survey, I find that in Cyprus there is 12% reporting rate as far as all cases of victimization are concerned (including not serious offences) while the reporting rate for serious offences is 33%. In essence serious crime has a higher reporting rate than minor offences.

What factors contribute to the high reporting of serious offences? The victims and the kin of victims of such crimes regularly sustain grave and persisting psychological damage (Lejeune and Alex 1973; Hilbernan 1976; Stuart 1977; Bennetts 1978; Fosburgh 1978; McCahill et al 1979; Ellis et al 1980; Maquire 1980; Silberman 1980; Terr 1981). This alone motivates victims to ask for revenge or amendments. For this reason more victims of serious crime come forward and report victimization to the police. Floud and Young (1981) maintain that public judgement of danger does not seem to be as inherently irrational and inconsistent as is sometimes suggested. I must place a footnote here because there is an issue of classification

of offences reported in this study. It is not clear whether the cases reported in this survey constitute criminal acts or whether cases reported to this study were serious enough or not.

The essence of this study is to record public attitude according to what they themselves have considered criminal. Therefore, this survey refers to that feeling and not to the rigid law classification.

It is important to note that non refugees as well as young people and urban residents have the highest dark figures of crime with reference both to serious and not serious offences; each one of them for a different reason. The non-refugees tend not to report because they rely mostly on cultural social control to solve and deter criminality while the young people do not report victimization because of resentment towards the police force. Urban residents do not report victimization on account that they live in an environment where there is disintegration in the social structure and the bond with the police is ineffective.

Old people as well as refugees have the greatest reporting rates as far as non-serious crime is concerned. In addition, University graduates, refugees, as well as old people have the greatest reporting rates for serious offences.

The above observations reinforce the argument of the structural social controls that are identifiable in the Cypriot society.

Police authorities should consider the following variables as sensitive when formulating a policing policy. These variables are non refugees, young people, and urban population because these social groups have the highest dark figures of crime. It is in these social groups where crime is hidden and most victims do not come forward to claim justice.

Tables of Chapter Five

Table 5.1 Total number of cases considered criminal last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Absolute numbers

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 82 | 53 | 29 | 25 | 48 | 9 | 37 | 55 | 61 | 21 | 39 | 25 | 18 |
| YES | 27 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 18 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| NO | 55 | 37 | 18 | 16 | 35 | 4 | 19 | 46 | 40 | 15 | 29 | 17 | 9 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.2 Total number of cases considered criminal last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Percentages

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 32.9 | 30.2 | 37.9 | 36.0 | 27.1 | 55.6 | 48.6 | 16.4 | 34.4 | 28.6 | 25.6 | 32.0 | 50.0 |
| NO | 67.1 | 69.8 | 62.1 | 64.0 | 72.9 | 44.4 | 51.4 | 83.6 | 65.6 | 71.4 | 74.4 | 68.0 | 50.0 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.3 Total number of cases considered criminal by witnesses last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Absolute numbers

| | | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DIS/PLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 27 | 22 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 13 | 14 | 25 | 2 | 14 | 6 | 7 |
| YES | 8 | 5 | 3 | - | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| NO | 19 | 17 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 18 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.4 Total number of cases considered criminal by witnesses last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Percentages.

| | | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | |
|------|-------|------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|--|-------|-------|------|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | | 15-22 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 29.6 | 22.7 | 60.0 | - | 41.2 | 33.3 | 30.8 | 28.6 | 28.0 | 50.0 | | 28.6 | 16.7 | 42.6 |
| NO | 70.4 | 77.3 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 58.8 | 66.7 | 69.2 | 71.4 | 72.0 | 50.0 | | 71.4 | 83.3 | 57.4 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - |

Table 5.5 Total number of cases considered criminal by relatives of victims last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Absolute numbers.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 12 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| YES | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| NO | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.6 Total number of cases considered criminal by relatives of victims last year and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Percentages.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 75.0 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 66.7 | 83.3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 66.7 |
| NO | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | - | 33.3 | 22.2 | 33.3 | 33.3 | - | 33.3 |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.7 Total number of cases considered criminal by relatives irrespective of time and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| YES | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| NO | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5.8 Total number of cases considered criminal by relatives irrespective of time and whether they have been reported to the authorities. Percentages.

| | | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|--|--------------|--------------|------------|--|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | | <u>15-22</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> | |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| YES | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| NO | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | |
| DIK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | |

Table 5.9 Number of cases considered as crime, reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED | NOT REPORTED | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | 22 | 35 | 16 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | 6 | 1 |
| a.Theft in general | | 4 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c.Burglary | 9 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item from car | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| f.Theft from the person | 1 | 5 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| g.Theft of property from outside the house | | 8 | 6 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | 5 | 6 | 1 | | 3 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | 3 | 15 | 4 | | | 8 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| a. Insult | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| b. Threatening | | 5 | | | | 4 | | | | | | 1 | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 2 | 7 | 3 | | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| a. Sexual | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 4. OTHER | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| a. Traffic | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| b. Gambling | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 27 | 55 | 21 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 |

Table 5.10

Percentages of cases considered as crime, reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED | NOT REPORTED | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|------|
| | | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 38.6% | 61.4% | 45.7 | 5.7 | 17.1 | 2.9 | 5.7 | | | 2.9 | 17.1 | 2.9 | 25.0 |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 100.0% | 100.0% | 50.0 | | 25.0 | | | | | | | | |
| c.Burglary | 69.2% | 30.8% | 50.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | 100.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item from car | 20.0% | 80.0% | 37.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | | | | | | 37.5 | | |
| f.Theft from the person | 16.7% | 83.3% | 40.0 | | 20.0 | | 20.0 | | | | 20.0 | | |
| g.Theft of property from outside the house | | 100.0% | 75.0 | 12.5 | | 12.5 | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | 45.4% | 54.6% | 16.7 | | 50.0 | | 16.7 | | | 16.6 | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | 16.7 | 83.3 | 26.7 | | | 53.2 | | 6.7 | | | 6.7 | 6.7 | |
| b. Threatening | 25.0% | 75.0% | 33.3 | | | | | 33.3 | | | | 33.4 | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 22.2% | 77.8% | 42.9 | | | 80.0 | 57.1 | | | | 20.0 | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | 50.0% | 50.0% | | | | | | | | | 100.0 | | |
| | 50.0% | 50.0% | | | | | | | | | 100.0 | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | 20.0% | 80.0% | 25.0 | | | | | 25.0 | | | | 50.0 | |
| b. Gambling | 25.0% | 75.0% | 33.4 | | | | | 100.0 | | | | 66.6 | |
| | | 100.0% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 32.9% | 67.1% | 38.2 | 3.6 | 10.9 | 16.4 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | - | 1.8 | 14.5 | 7.4 |

Table 5.14 Number of cases witnessed by subjects, reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED | NOT REPORTED | a | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 5 | 4 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 1 | 4 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| c.Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f.Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| g.Theft of property from | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | |
| b. Threatening | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 1 | 8 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | 2 | 6 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| b. Gambling | 2 | 5 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 19 | | 2 | 3 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 1 |

Table 5.15 Percentages of cases reported by witnesses, reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED (%) | NOT REPORTED (%) | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|------|---|------|------|------|---|------|------|-----|
| | | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 55.6 | 44.4 | | | 50 | | 25 | | | | | 25 | |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 100 | 100 | | | 50 | | 25 | | | | | 25 | |
| c.Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f.Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| g.Theft of property from | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | 10 | 90 | 10 | | 10 | | 20 | 20 | | | | 10 | |
| b. Threatening | | 100 | | | | | 100 | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 11.1 | 88.9 | 12.5 | | 12.5 | | 12.5 | 25 | | | | 12.5 | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | 25 | 75 | 16.6 | | | | 16.7 | 16.7 | | | 16.7 | 16.7 | |
| b. Gambling | 28.6 | 71.4 | 20 | | | | 20 | 20 | | | 20 | | |
| TOTAL | 37 | 63 | 10.5 | | 15.8 | | 21 | 15.8 | 10.5 | | 5.3 | 15.8 | 5.3 |

Table 5.16 Number of cases reported by relatives of the victims, cases reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED | NOT REPORTED | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| | | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g h i j k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Theft in general | 7 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| b. Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| c. Burglary | | | | | | | | | |
| d. Attempting a breaking | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| e. Theft of part or item from car | | | | | | | | | |
| f. Theft from the person | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| g. Theft of property from outside the house | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| h. Criminal damage | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Threatening | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Gambling | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 9 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | |

Table 5.17 Percentages of cases reported by relatives of the victims, cases reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED (%) | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| | | NOT REPORTED (%) | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h i j k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 70 | | | | | | | | | | 33.3 |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 33.3 | | | | | | | | | | 50 |
| c.Burglary | 100 | 30 | 66.7 | | | | | | | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item from car | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| f.Theft from the person | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| g.Theft of property from outside the house | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Threatening | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Gambling | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 75 | 25 | 66.7 | | | | | | | | 33.3 |

Table 5.18 Number of cases reported by relatives of the victims irrespective of time of occurrence, the number of cases reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c.Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item from car | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f.Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| g.Theft of property from outside the house | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Gambling | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5.19 Percentages of cases reported by relatives of the victims irrespective of time of occurrence, the number of cases reported to the police and the reasons for not doing so.

| OFFENCES | REPORTED (%) | REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | NOT REPORTED | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| 1. PROPERTY OFFENCES | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.Theft in general | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b.Theft of bicycle/motorbike | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c.Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d.Attempting a breaking | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e.Theft of part or item | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f.Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| g.Theft of property from | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| outside the house | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| h.Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Insult | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Violent behaviour | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. SEXUAL OFFENCES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Sexual | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Gambling | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5.20 Comparisons of cases of victimisation, cases considered as criminal by the victims and the number of cases reported to the police.

| VARIABLES | | -----a----- Victimization cases | -----b----- Victimization cases considered as crime | -----c----- Cases considered b/a crime police report | c/a | c/b |
|-----------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|------|------|
| Sex | Male | 140 | 53 | 37.9 | 11.4 | 30.2 |
| | Female | 86 | 29 | 33.7 | 12.8 | 37.9 |
| Education | Elementary | 51 | 25 | 49.0 | 17.6 | 36.0 |
| | Secondary | 151 | 48 | 31.8 | 8.6 | 27.1 |
| | University | 24 | 9 | 37.5 | 20.8 | 55.6 |
| Displaced | Refugees | 82 | 37 | 45.1 | 22.0 | 48.6 |
| | Non-refugees | 144 | 45 | 31.3 | 6.3 | 20.0 |
| Marital | Married | 114 | 43 | 37.7 | | |
| | Single | 112 | 39 | 34.8 | | |
| Residency | Urban | 183 | 61 | 33.3 | 11.5 | 34.4 |
| | Rural | 43 | 21 | 48.8 | 14.0 | 28.6 |
| Age group | 15-29 | 116 | 39 | 33.6 | 8.6 | 25.6 |
| | 30-44 | 73 | 25 | 34.2 | 11.0 | 32.0 |
| | 45-60 | 37 | 18 | 48.6 | 24.3 | 50.0 |
| TOTAL | | 226 | 82 | 36.3 | 11.9 | 32.9 |

PART THREE

THE CYPRIOT PROFILE OF VICTIMIZATION

CHAPTER 6

TOTAL AMOUNT AND PATTERNS OF CRIME IN CYPRUS

6.1 SUMMARY

In this part of the survey I will attempt to formulate the total amount and patterns of crime in Cyprus. This will be achieved, by the projection of the number of cases reported, according to the level of the defined dark figure of crime.

Specific offences have a different factor of frequency of reporting. This is due to sociological characteristics of the Cypriot culture (note previous chapters on tolerance to crime and administration of social defence mechanism which both are products of the collective consciousness).

Findings indicate that victims prefer not to report serious personal offences on account that these are inappropriate for the police.

When community policing is applied and society is motivated to control its criminality, certain vulnerable sections of society will be left unprotected. These people will fall victims to the existing norms, stigmatization, and values which the society places on certain forms of victimization. These forms of victimization include sexual offences and domestic violence.

6.2 AMOUNT OF CRIME EXISTING IN CYPRUS

Total Amount of Household offences

This study will attempt to make a comparison between crime patterns in England and Wales and Cyprus. For this reason there is a need to compare total crime including dark figures, i.e. crime which is not reported.

The England and Wales data were calculated by crime surveys, while the Cypriot data were calculated from the number of cases reported in this survey. To be precise, the Cypriot figures were weighed up in order to be representative and cohesive with the opposite figures of other surveys. I have employed a simple method of weighing up results mainly by using:

1000 x Number of crimes reported = Estimates of offences
Number of households questioned per 1000 households.

Table 6.1 shows that the Cypriot offences reported per 1000 households are considerably less than those offences reported per 1000 households in England and Wales. It is evident that the above figures represent readings from crime surveys and not numbers of cases reported to the authorities. For this reason I accept that there could be means of errors either in the calculations or in the methodology or procedure of this study or the definition of offences. These readings are estimates to the nearest arithmetic figure. The essence however, (of the above

Footnote:

* The Cypriot proportion of 1000 population which is referred to the above ratios is relevant only to 15 year olds and above. The England and Wales figures include all ages. For this reason I wish to draw attention to the fact that the Cypriot crime readings are overevaluated on account that the proportion of population does not include children i.e. 21% which is mostly non criminal.

figures, as well as the ones which will follow) is that an attempt will be made to enlighten the science of criminology about the extent of crime in Cyprus in comparison to England and Wales in relation to the method of policing, and cultural characteristics, including the strength of collective conscience (Durkheim).

With reference to thefts, which also include attempts, it is shown that the Cypriot survey shows 84 cases as opposed to 912 cases of B.C.S. (1981). The difference is not only in the magnitude of the two readings but also in the severity of the thefts in question as well. I must note that in Cyprus there is no organized crime and the cases presented are petty thefts with a considerably low value. On the other hand in England and Wales there is organized crime which preys on items of luxury and items of high value rather than items of necessity as in Cyprus.

As far as the theft of bicycles is concerned, it is shown that in Cyprus there are 10 cases of reported thefts while in England and Wales the corresponding figure is 12. Surely thefts of bicycles in England and Wales are more than in Cyprus. The density of bicycles in England and Wales is higher than that of Cyprus and the logical perspective is that, the more bicycles in a country the more occurrences of thefts of bicycles. The figures of England & Wales do not show this effect. Unless I study the dark figures of crime for this specific offence and the reason why victims do not report their victimization, I cannot make an assumption for this low figure of report. On the other hand, it is hard to steal a bicycle or indeed a motorcycle in Cyprus and get away with it. People know each other and it is hard for strangers to come to the neighbourhoods to steal because they are spotted immediately. In the event when bicycles are stolen, then the possibility to recover them is higher in Cyprus than in England and Wales because the police have the ability, due

to its density in the society and its status within circles to clear up cases of stolen bicycles and recover the items stolen (note high clear-up figures).

With reference to burglaries, it is shown that there are 26 cases in the Cypriot survey of victimization while for the corresponding study in B.C.S. (1981) the figure is 41 cases. The high figure presented for England and Wales is justifiable on account of the anomie and urbanization that exist in the country. In Cyprus people still live the traditional ways of life, which in a way offer no fertile ground for burglaries.

On top of all these the motivation for burglars to steal is higher in England and Wales on account of unemployment, criminal subculture and the fact that goods are appealing, for example T.V., stereos, videos, etc. Furthermore, goods are easily carried away and easily disposed of. Before going on further with the description of other offences, I wish to state that the Cypriot readings are somewhat exaggerated on account that most of the cases reported refer to thefts of items with not much value such as flower pots, clothes from washing lines, and thefts of fruit which are in a way not comparable to the ones mentioned for England and Wales. What I am insinuating is that most of the Cypriot cases would have gone even unreported by the standards of England and Wales and classified as "no case", or "not serious offences".

The following cases relate to thefts of components from the car. In the C.C.S. (1985) 65 cases were calculated in relation to a proportion of 1000 households, while the corresponding figure for B.C.S. (1981) is 70 cases and 216a for H.A.F.C.P.S.(1988). The B.C.S. (1981) & H.A.F.C.P.S. (1988) suggest that this type of offences, as well as the ones which relate to car vandalism, are the most frequent forms of crime in England and Wales as they have been reported in the British crime surveys. The most

likely reasons that justify the high figures of such crimes in England and Wales are related: to the high density of cars as well as the organized subculture of criminals in the country. The Cypriots lack such criminals, nor is the density of cars as high as that of England and Wales.

With reference to criminal damage or vandalism there have been 35 cases calculated for the Cypriot Crime Survey while the corresponding figure for I.C.S. is 202 and B.C.S. is 149. These are considerably high proportions. The high proportions of cases of criminal damage or vandalism recorded in the I.C.S. and B.C.S. are due to the fact that the environment offers a number of likely targets such as telephone kiosks, dense residential blocks of flats, council estates without caretakers, no proper illumination in certain streets, car parks with no proper security. The destruction of property by hooligans and rioters within the last years have contributed to the large figures recorded in the B.C.S, and I.C.S.

On the other hand, hooliganism and riots are very rare, if non-existent, in Cyprus. This explains the low figures reported to the Cypriot Crime Survey. Car density and telephone kiosks in Cyprus are considerably fewer than in England and Wales, therefore the proportions of vandalism and criminal damage is somewhat less. Council flats in England and Wales can be compared with the R.H.E. (Refugee Housing Estates) in Cyprus with the exception that council flat residents are working class and unemployed people. The difference with the R.H.E. is that, here reside professionals as well as upper working class to managerial class residents, where their common feature is the fact that they have lost their homes during the 1974 Turkish invasion. In essence the R.H.E. have a better social communication factor in relation to council flats in the UK, where the residents of flats live in isolation. Racism is another feature which contributes to the anomie

in the Council estates which inevitably contributes to the flourishing of vandalism. I have to make it clear that I am not saying that vandalism is the result of racism. What I am saying is that anomie exists in council estates due to the fact that most people do not socialize in the estates because some of them come from different ethnic groups. This means that there is no unity in the estates, (due to anomie), and as a consequence vandals cannot be deterred adequately from damaging property. The lack of proper lighting, policing, social network, community spirit lead to a breeding ground for vandals. Only a limited number of refugees live in comfortable flats, and their numbers gradually decrease because Cypriots have a need to own their own land.

Vandalism is very scarce in R.H.E. because most of the young families prefer to get out of the R.H.E. and buy their own land. The ones left behind are either too old or working class people who in a way wait their turn to buy themselves out of the R.H.E. For this reason young people as well as older people, find that they are not crowded and the space around them can accommodate their expansionistic feelings of venture, unlike the space of the council flats where the people feel overcrowded, insecure and threatened. Children and young people are directed towards destruction when there are no other suitable ways of expressing their aggression. By "suitable ways" I mean playgrounds, better housing and fine social relations within and outside the family. Therefore, vandalism is an expression of aggression which is manifested by the lack of proper defense mechanisms such as play, socialization. In places like Cyprus such expressions are controlled by social norms and values which are manifested in the collective conscience.

As I have already said, in council flats (in some degenerate areas of England and Wales) there are not enough

playgrounds or amenities where children can relieve and express their aggression. On top of this, anomie affects socialization considerably which generalizes the most crucial ingredients for vandalism and general antisocial behaviour.

Later on Cypriot R.H.E. were built with some careful planning trying to avoid the mistakes of the council estates in the U.K. in some cases. The R.H.E. in Cyprus are not isolated from external influences because they are located close to a village or town. Whenever there is trouble in the R.H.E. then it is immediately confined by the social control system of the area. It is evident that kinship in Cyprus is still strong. However, in recent years a breaking of the chain of kinship has appeared in the R.H.E. on account that families want to live somewhere on owned property rather than government land. This move has split families and as a consequence the influence of the family on its members (specifically on its black sheep) is rather weak. However, it is true to say that in recent years, contrary to what has already been said, there is a limited increase of specific crime in the R.H.E., such as vandalism and violent behaviour.

Total Amount of Personal Offences

With reference to theft from the person, it is shown that in Cyprus there are 42 cases while the corresponding figure for I.C.S. is 139 and B.C.S. is 53. Again the high figure presented for England and Wales is justified on account that in the country there is organized crime such as gangs of pick pockets who prey on unsuspected commuters or people walking in the streets of London. Recently the metropolitan police has discovered foreign gangs adding a touch of professionalism to the crime of theft from the person. Cyprus, on the other hand, is considered free from professional pick pockets but recent increase of the

tourist industry as well as the influx in the country of refugees from neighbouring countries have consequently changed this situation.

I have to make it clear that the readings for Cyprus are illusive and not representative. In the formulation of the number of cases reported, it has been stated that a considerably large number of old respondents in Cyprus have informed me that they were not certain whether their purse was misplaced or stolen. For certain statistical reasons (maybe respondents in England and Wales have the same problem) I have found it necessary to include these figures in the total sum of thefts from the person. Therefore, I express the reservation about the representativeness of the above mentioned figure.

As far as violent behaviour is concerned, Cyprus has 40 cases while I.S.C. has 186 cases and B.C.S. 49 cases which is the sum of common assault and wounding. Again the high figures for England and Wales are justifiable on account of the criminal subculture which exists in the country. A large number of cases of violent behaviour is the result of hooliganism and rioting which in Cyprus are very scarce if not non-existent. In addition to the above, I believe that in England and Wales there are more possibilities for assailants to resort to violence (such as in furtherance of a theft, robbery, breaking, in under the influence of alcohol or drugs, etc). These possibilities are very scarce in Cyprus.

As far as sexual offences are concerned, in Cyprus there have been no serious crimes reported per 1000 population while the corresponding figures for the same proportion of population in I.C.S. are 19 B.C.S. are 2 and H.A.F.C.P.S. are 19. I would like to make a note that the figures must be seen with scepticism on account that sexual offences are scarcely reported to crime surveys by the victims, let alone to the police. Women of both countries

find it hard to recall their suffering to strangers due to the fact that rape or sexual abuse is considered as stigmatization in both societies. For this reason I cannot accept either readings as representative. It is worth, however, considering the readings for reference and future analysis.

6.3 AMOUNT OF CRIME REPORTED TO THE AUTHORITIES

Amount of Household Offences Reported to the Authorities

Table 6.2 presents a comparison of the rate of offences reported of certain crimes. These crimes are considered as the most frequent offences in both countries.

It must be noted that Cyprus has a lower reporting for theft offences than England and Wales. Cyprus has a low rate of reporting due to the fact of the close society syndrome. As I have already mentioned, people in Cyprus are bound by social collectiveness and reporting by victims is infrequent on account that they do not wish to externalize victimization for a number of reasons. However, up to a certain extent, victims themselves partly report their victimization to the police because, as I have said earlier, the police have the trust of the people. In England and Wales, unlike Cyprus, people mistrust the police and prefer not to report their cases on account that they believe that the police will not offer them assistance. At a following section, I will investigate the reasons as to why victims do not report their victimization.

With reference to thefts of bicycles or motorcycles, it is noted that Cyprus has 100% reporting rate while England and Wales has an 18% reporting rate. The high rate of reporting in Cyprus is certainly due to the fact that bicycles and motorcycles are highly valued. The same goes with cars in England and Wales. The B.C.S. has shown that

car thefts have a 100% reporting rate. It is worth noting that all cars in England and Wales are covered from the insurance point of view "theft and fire". Unless there is a report from the police the insurance do not pay. That is why thefts of cars have such a high reporting rate. I can relate this with the bicycles of the Cypriots. Their bicycles are considered as valuable property which, in some cases, is responsible for their living. That is why bicycles are so dear to the Cypriots (Note that there is no bicycle insurance in Cyprus).

Concerning burglaries, Cyprus has a 69% reporting rate while England and Wales has a 68% reporting rate. Both countries have a considerable high rate of reporting. In England and Wales I believe this is due to the fact that most houses are insured and there is a likely possibility that owners will get their money or property back if burgled. Therefore, there is some kind of willingness to report their victimization because they will be reimbursed and their property returned. I cannot say the same about Cyprus. The high rate of reporting is due to the fact that the Cypriots consider that the police will clear up their case and in a way retrieve their property. However, this is not the case, with uninsured victims in the U.K. They somehow accept the possibility that police would do nothing about their losses. This constitutes the reason why they do not report their victimization. The insurance business is not very extensive in Cyprus. However, as time goes by, it will become very popular. The logical effect they would have on burglaries is that they will increase the rate of reporting including burglaries which otherwise might go unreported. In essence, the reporting rate would increase while the dark figure of crime would go down.

As far as theft from the car is concerned, Cyprus has a 20% reporting rate while England and Wales has a 43% reporting rate. The major observation is that both figures

are low and Cypriot figures even lower than England and Wales. It is a fact that car components are a high temptation both to thieves and vandals in whatever country they are. The low figures of reporting in Cyprus are mainly due to the fact that people (victims) prefer not to give much emphasis on their case of victimization because they consider their case as not serious. Another reason is that most of the time parts or components are stolen from cars that are usually parked away from home and away from the friendly neighbourhood police officer who will listen to their complaint. I believe that victims do not bother to go and report their victimization because they feel that they may not find cooperation from the local police.

With reference to criminal damage or vandalism, it is observed that Cyprus has a rate of 45% while England and Wales a rate of 21%, almost half of those in Cyprus. Really the figure for England and Wales is considerably lower than that of Cyprus. There are a number of reasons why this should be. Vandalism in England and Wales is sometimes considered as not a serious offence and victims prefer to forget the case rather than go through police reporting. The B.C.S. (1981) has pointed out that a large part of the criminal damage offences that have occurred in England and Wales have to do with car vandalism. People do not report the damage of their car due to the fact that they believe that it is worth fixing the damaged car rather than reporting the case to the police. Besides, if victims reported the damage of their cars, certainly their insurance fees might go up and thus appear too costly to them. I believe that this prevents victims from reporting vandalism on their cars. This is true for both countries, perhaps it is more evident in England and Wales than Cyprus.

Amount of Personal Offences Reported to the Authorities

As far as thefts from the person are concerned, I note that Cyprus shows a 17% rate of reporting while England and Wales show a 33% rate of reporting. Care should be taken to the low figure for Cyprus which is mainly due to the fact that a number of old victims reported cases of loss of money and were not certain if money and purse were stolen or misplaced. They have indicated that for these cases they have not reported the issue to the police merely because they were not certain as to what happened to their money. For this reason I cannot compare the two figures of England and Wales and Cyprus because the two readings are not comparable.

As far as violent behaviour is concerned, Cyprus has a 22.2% rate of reporting while England and Wales has a 37% reporting rate. I must make it clear that in the above proportion I have not included offences such as threatening behaviour nor insulting behaviour. Bearing in mind responses from C.C.S (1985), I can draw the conclusion that Cypriot victims of violent offences prefer not to report their case to the police on account that the offence is considered as not serious and sometimes it is considered as a personal matter.

With reference to sexual offences, I cannot say anything due to the fact that I have already stated that the figures are not representative. In Cyprus, only two cases were reported, of which only one was to the police. Under these circumstances I cannot say with certainty that the Cypriot figures are representative or indeed valid. The reasons for not reporting sexual offences have already been stated in an earlier chapter.

When comparing the reasons for not reporting crime in England and Wales and Cyprus, it is shown that these reflect the cultural aspects of policing in either country.

The Cypriots give emphasis on tolerance while in England and Wales people refer to police performance and triviality of case.

More will be said on the following section, concerning the reasons why people do not report victimization to the authorities in Cyprus and England and Wales.

6.4 REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME TO THE AUTHORITIES

Table 6.3 presents a comparison by percentages of the reasons why certain victims were deterred from reporting their victimization to the police.

The immediate conclusion to be drawn from the study of the above Table is that the most frequent reason which deters victims from reporting their victimization to the police relates to the assumption that the case is too trivial or not serious. Seriousness of crime is a cognitive evaluation (Wolfgang et al 1985). Perception of crime seriousness involves two or more dimensions (Gottfredson et al 1988; Hansel 1987; How 1988; Sherman and Dowlde 1974). The above are Uni-dimensional characteristics (Schneider 1982) whereas the multi-dimensional characteristics are: more than one conceptual attribute (Forgas 1980; Gottfredson et al 1988; Hansel 1987; Howe 1988; Rahar and Teichman 1984; Sherman and Dowdle 1974; Shoham et al 1970). Intentionality and victim harm are the two primary dimensions: (Forgans 1980 and Rahar 1980). The offender's characteristics are important determinants of crime seriousness judgement. Anyhow, Parton et al (1991) dispute as to whether there is a single scale where one registers magnitude of seriousness of crime.

As far as personal offences are concerned, I find that the highest reading is that which relates to triviality as an explanation for both countries. As far as the second most frequent reason for not reporting personal offences,

the Cypriots indicated that this is due to the assumption that they will deal with the matter personally, whereas victims in England & Wales indicated that the police would do nothing about the issue. Clearly there is a difference as to the explanation given for not reporting the offences to the police by either country. The Cypriot society is a close one and they prefer to solve their problems by themselves rather than to involve outsiders. The above refers only to personal offences. When I refer to personal offences I mean violence or G.B.H. (Grievous Bodily Harm). Cypriots feel that their masculinity has to be protected and the only way to be achieved is to protect themselves from the humiliation by not going to the police (note stigmatization).

In order for the outsider to understand the Cypriots, he must bear in mind that the society is by large patrimonial because men are considered as the financial controllers and there is a high expectation by males to express their masculinity and authority inside and outside the family. That is why a large number of male Cypriots have not reported their victimization to the authorities.

The third most frequent reason why Cypriots do not report offences of personal crime to the police relates to the assumption that the police would do nothing. The corresponding reason for England and Wales relates to the assumption that the matter would be dealt personally by the victim. Again there is a difference in the order or frequency of explanations as to why certain people do not report their victimization to the police. The Cypriot police ability to cope with personal offences is for the first time under question. It has a proportion of 7.7% of all responses. This is a low figure of reporting and really it supports popular belief that victims do not report their victimization on account that the police would do nothing about their case. As far as personal offences are

concerned I have recorded no responses which relate to police interest or fear of reprisals. Another 23% of the responses refer to other vague reasons.

6.5 DISCUSSION

With reference to chapter six it is possible to formulate comparable figures of total victimization in Cyprus for certain offences. The above readings do not include multiple victimization. For this reason I am inclined to point out that the above readings are not absolute. I would also like to give a warning against the credibility of the above tables, due to errors of formulation.

Because of the crime definition as well as the differences in the method of crime recordings in the above mentioned surveys, I cannot say with certainty that the above comparisons are absolute. The above readings should be seen as indicators of the extent of victimization only.

In essence, the above readings suggest that in Cyprus the main forms of victimization are in the form of "theft of property" "theft of items from m/v" "threatening behaviour", "theft from the person" and "common assault".

As far as the surveys in the U.K. are concerned, they show that the most common forms of victimization refer to "criminal damage" "common assault" "theft from the person" (I.C.S. 1986) "criminal damage", "other notifiable theft" and "theft of items from the m/v" (B.C.S. 1981). "Theft of items from m/v", "burglaries" and "common assault" (H.A.F.C.P.S. 1989).

If the above tables have failed to produce a common indication of the forms of crime in either country, this is on account of the fact that specification of crime is also a factor of many variables including social structure, method of policing, economic situation, or geographic location. For instance, Islington as well as Hammersmith

and Fulham are mostly working class areas, which are noted for civil unrest, unemployment and the numerous council estates. These conditions generate specific forms of criminality such as vandalism, burglaries, as well as thefts in general. In Cyprus the phenomenon of vandalism, or indeed criminal damage, is limited on account that a) people own their own property, b) the magnitude of difference between social classes is small. Only a small proportion of Cypriots are unemployed i.e. 2% and again only a fraction of the population live in rented houses or flats. As I have already said, (generally speaking), anomie (Durkheim) in Cyprus is much less than that in England and Wales. Also opportunities to commit vandalism are also fewer in Cyprus (Merton). Once on the note of opportunistic crime, it is true to say that criminal behaviour is strongly affected by the opportunities presented to the potential offender for committing criminal acts (Clarke and Mayher 1989). For instance it is harder to steal a car if this is equipped with column locks (Cornish and Clarke 1989), or Firearms availability is associated with Firearms homicides (Lester 1991).

Unfortunately, there is no available data to compare seriousness of offences reported in all the presented surveys. However, as far as Cyprus is concerned, the majority of cases reported refer to theft "theft of flowers", "clothes", "flower pots", "garden tools" and "money"; also "theft of petrol from m/v," "spot lights", "rear mirrors", as well as "aerials". As far as criminal damage is concerned, this is mainly affecting cars and car accessories. The above descriptions of victimization also define the extent of seriousness of crime.

It is appropriate here to present the anecdote referring to the most frequent form of victimization reported in the B.C.S. (1981). It was found that the "theft of milk bottles" outside the house was the number

one offence. Similarly the most frequent form of victimization in Cyprus is that referring to the "theft of flowers and flower pots" outside the house.

What is perhaps undervalued from the above list of offences recorded are those referring to "other form of personal crimes" which are considered as serious: crimes such as sexual offences and grievous bodily harm, etc. Quite understandably, these offences have low recording rates not only in Cyprus but in all parts of the world. Maclean (1986) defines the problems of recording such offences (the same can be about Cyprus):

"Because sexual assault generally, and in particular the most serious occurrence such as rape, has the potential of creating harmful effects on the victims and their families and because there is often a stigma attached to victims. It is very difficult to ask women in the interview situation to relive their experience" (Maclean 1986 p. 3.30).

The above statement is applicable to the Cypriot situation not only for sexual offences against women but also offences related to violence and generally personal offences against males such as grievous bodily harm. This is explained in social terms by the concept of "Timi", honour. Cypriots are also known for maintaining high social status such as morality and honour. In the past, honour was the cause of crime Clifford (1954b) summarises:

"Throughout the years, crimes of honour and those connected with family vendettas have been a feature of Cyprus life" (Clifford 1954b p.149).

Nowadays, Cypriots are deterred from contacting vendettas on account of the social control which is applied on them by the changing society. However, since the

Cypriots are unable to externalize victimization, they tend, up to one extent, to internalize and tolerate vengeful behaviour. For this reason an amount, of crime goes undetected by both police reporting as well as survey reporting.

Another issue which a formulating community policing theory should take into serious consideration is that which refers to the level of social values in society and the extent to which these values will tolerate victimization. This is the lowest level of social control (i.e. the person on his own accord and without being influenced by the environment would tolerate antisocial behaviour).

Having said this, I would like once again to point out that the above data are not quite representative of real victimization but merely an indication.

Observing the tables in this chapter, two striking results are evident:

The first one relates to the fact that the victims do not come forward to report a crime on account that the "police could do nothing" both in Cyprus and in the U.K. The Cypriot respondents in a way have played down this explanation whereas the England and Wales respondents gave much emphasis on this reason. It surely means that the British respondents have indicated that they do not trust the police to deal with their victimization. Under the term "trust" one also assumes values like satisfaction, objectivity, fairness etc. This endorses the domino effect suggested earlier on about the police-public relationship. A good relationship will inevitably have a positive effect on all aspects of policing issues.

The second one relates to the fact that the Cypriots have considered personal offences "inappropriate for the police". The rate is significantly higher when considered with that of property offences. This gives me ground to bring back to the scene the concept which states that

Cypriots (mostly males) do not report to the authorities personal offences because they find it undignified and shameful. Silence is a product of men's hesitation to disclose vulnerability (Maxfield 1984; Crawford et al 1990), man's hegemonic masculinity, (Connell 1987). It is natural to talk about subordination of women but not of that of men (Kelly 1988; Stanko 1985). However, Crawford (et al 1990) offers no explanation. Stanko and Hobdell (1993) give a general view which is similar to the explanation I endorse:

"It appears that male victims of assault view their victimization through a male frame, the essence of which sees victimization as 'weak and helpless'. This creates difficulties for men in expressing feelings, leaving them isolated and unable to ask for support" (Stankon and Hobdell 1993 p.413).

Cypriots see it as a stigma for a victim to go to the police. Note that the policeman could be his neighbour, relative, or friend. Perhaps it is alright to report property offence but it is not right to report a personal offence. This social stigma acts as a deterring agent against reporting. One has to be familiar with the social network of kinship in order to understand the strong masculinity feelings that possess the male Cypriots.

Attalides (1981) gives an insight into male clustering in "parea", friendship:

"Firstly, there is a striking small number of both inborn and migrant individuals who consider themselves isolated. Secondly about two thirds of both groups mention relatives when asked to name categories of individuals with whom they mainly associate..." (Attalides 1981 p. 170).

The "parees" are signified by the strong social links of the members. Values such as comradeship, antagonism, conformity, are well evident. The "parees" is another social group other than the family where social control is exercised. The group leader has control of the behaviour of the members of the gang. The "parees" are formed mostly by relatives as described above.

Therefore, a person is deterred from reporting a personal offence on account that he does not wish to undermined his position in the "parea" and become the topic of ridicule. It all comes to the factor of anomie in society. In addition, the person does not report personal offences on account that the district police officer might be his friend, neighbour, or relative. Again this means that the police are not informed.

But how does the above behaviour by males coincide with what I have already stated at the beginning, i.e. the people of Cyprus are satisfied by police practices as well as the high level of confidence they project towards the police force? Explanation: the Cypriots are satisfied and think very highly of the police as long as it does not interfere with personal matters. This is the point where the police-public relationship is tested. I believe that there is a mutual understanding between police and public when neither party wishes for situations to get out of hand. Such situations include violence in the house, personal quarrels between relatives and generally crimes involving kinship. I am not suggesting that the police do not want to get involved but what I am saying is that there is a reluctance by victims or witnesses to report victimization to the police on personal offences.

As far as violence in the house is concerned, most couples do not inform the police on the understanding that this is a family issue and no matter for the police. Shepherd (1990) has studied accident incidents at casualty

in Bristol and concluded that domestic violence was higher than that reported in the British Crime survey. Some victims may feel wholly or in part responsible for what happened (Shepherd 1989). Some victims are prevented from receiving treatment by their assailants (Gayford 1975). Some injuries do not constitute seriousness (Shepherd et al 1987a). More female victims than males attend the Accident and Emergency Department, ages 30-34 (Grayford 1975). Attendance of women decreased over the Christmas period supporting the hypothesis that marital ties are more highly valued at this time of the year (Shepherd 1990). McCabe and Sutcliffe (1978) have the same opinion as far as violence in the house is concerned. The above is supported by the close society concept.

On the other hand, when the police are informed by third parties concerning domestic violence, usually the wife, if she is the victim, does not launch a complaint. It is widely observed that women in Cyprus endure a number of social hardships for the sake of preserving family security and welfare. An elaborate example is the fact that usually in Cyprus women do not quite easily divorce their estranged husbands. Although the Cypriot church deters divorce seekers, in the Cypriot society women do not ask for divorce although ample ground is given to them to file for one. They are largely deterred by the stigma the society will place on divorced women. The same can be said about sexually abused women or victims of violence.

As far as rape cases are concerned, I note that the majority of rape cases or attempted rapes reported to the police refer to female foreign victims (Hadjidemetriou 1985). I suggest that rape cases do exist in Cyprus but only the ones which victimize foreign nationals are reported. This is so because foreigners have a different tolerance level; they are more inclined to come forward and report victimization. Another reason which might explain

non reporting by a Cypriot victim is included in the Greek saying that states:

"Τα εν οίκω μη εν δήμω".

It means that one should not publicize home affairs. Up to an extent it is true, because the syndrome of close society does not allow external influences in the family or indeed anybody getting involved.

In addition to what I have said earlier, I believe that, as far as personal offences are concerned, I am inclined to suggest that it is quite impossible to measure the extent of such offences, specially in Cyprus where the social structure with its rigid norms placed on certain actions, deter victims from coming forward to report their case. I must admit that this is one of the prices the Cypriots have to pay if they wish to maintain this social polarization. As long as the police are kept at a distance from social control in the family (because there is no wish to question the authority of the head figure), I am afraid a proportion of serious crime will go unreported. As a consequence, a section of the population (i.e. the weak and vulnerable to social stigmatization) will never come under the umbrella of the policing system.

Again before applying any policing policy, one should take into consideration cultural differences, population segregation as well as social values placed on the structure of the society.

Footnote:

The issue presented earlier, suggesting that victims do not prefer to report offences against the person, is endorsed by the Cypriot criminal statistics No15 1988 p44, where it shows that only 56% of the victims prefer to report as opposed to 81% of the offences against the property.

Tables of Chapter Six

Table 6.1 Proportion of crime per 1000 H/H or 1000 residents (15+ years old)

Victimization Rate per 1000 Household.

| Offence categories | C.C.S | | I.C.S | | B.C.S | | H A.F.C.P.S | |
|----------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------------|------|
| | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1986 | 1981 | 1981 | 1989 | 1989 |
| Household offences | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 1. Other notifiable theft | 84 | NA | NA | NA | 912 | NA | NA | NA |
| 2. Theft of Motor vehicle | - | 37 | 16 | 91 | | | | |
| 3. Theft of items from M/V | 65 | NA | 70 | 216a | | | | |
| 4. Theft of bicycle | 19 | NA | 12 | NA | | | | |
| 5. Burglary | 26 | 123 | 41 | 125 | | | | |
| 6. Criminal damage | 35 | 202 | 149 | NA | | | | |
| Personal offences | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Threatening behaviour | 51 | NA | NA | NA | | | | |
| 8. Common assault | 40 | 186 | 54 | 98 | | | | |
| 9. Theft from the person | 42 | 139 | 53 | NA | | | | |
| 10. Sexual | -* | 19 | 2 | 19 | | | | |

- None was reported
a Estimated
NA Non applicable

* No prompting was made on sexual offences.

Table 6.2 Amount of crime reported in Cyprus and England and Wales

Amount of crime reported to the police

| Offence categories | C.C.S.* | B.C.S |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|
| Household offences | 1986 | 1983 |
| 1. Theft in general | 17 | 23 |
| 2. Theft of bicycle | 100 | 68 |
| 3. Burglary | 69 | 68 |
| 4. Theft of part or item from M/V | 20 | 43 |
| 5. Criminal damage | 45 | 21 |
| Personal offences | | |
| 6. Theft from the person | 17 | 33 |
| 7. Insult | 33 | NA |
| 8. Threatening behaviour | - | NA |
| 9. Violent behaviour | 22 | 37 |
| 10. Sexual | 50 | 8 |

*Reference only to serious offences

- None was mentioned

N.A Non - applicable

Table 6.3 Frequency and reasons for not notifying the police

| Reasons why police werenot notified. | C.C.S. | | I.C.S. | | B.C.S. | | H.A.F.C.P.S. | |
|---|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------------|-----|
| | 1986 | | 1986 | | 1983 | | 1989 | |
| | H/H | PER | H/H | PER | H/H | PER | H/H | PER |
| 1. Too trivial | 46.7 | 38.5 | 26 | 49.0 | 38.0 | 36.0 | 40.0 | |
| 2. Police could do nothing | 16.7 | 7.7 | 37.8 | 34.0 | 16.0 | 49.0 | 32.0 | |
| 3. Inappropriate for the police | 3.3 | 30.8 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 13.0 | - | - | |
| 4. Police would not be interested | 6.7 | - | - | 9.0 | 3.0 | - | - | |
| 5. Fear of reprisals | - | - | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 | - | - | |
| 6. Other reasons | 26.6 | 23.0 | 27.5 | 2.0 | 28.0 | 16.0 | 28.0 | |

CHAPTER 7

CYPRriot PATTERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CRIMINALITY

7.1 SUMMARY

Having described in earlier chapters the extent of crime in Cyprus, recorded as well as not recorded, I will now investigate people's understanding of the magnitude of crime in Cyprus as well as their opinions on what measures the state should enforce in order to deter and prevent crime.

Results show that Cypriots are mostly influenced by the media. Their perception of criminality derives mostly from the way media give coverage to the issue of crime. In England and Wales fear is more evident on account of the large numbers of crime in the country, as well as the occurring experience of victimization.

Due to the misconception of the extent of crime in Cyprus, respondents in this survey have suggested that the state should take harsher measures in combating this situation.

However, if these measures, which are really based on a faulty understanding of the magnitude of crime in Cyprus, were to be enforced, then this would lead to a chain reaction which would result in the unbalancing of the whole social control network.

7.2 PERCEIVING THE AMOUNT OF CRIME BY THE PUBLIC

Evaluation of Criminality in Cyprus

In Summary, the results show that, overall, the people of Cyprus believe that crime has risen, despite what

official statistics say. The reason for the development of such attitude will be presented when I am dealing with the influence of the media and the effect of social interactions on the Cypriot.

In this chapter I will try to analyze responses on a number of issues relating to the people's perception of crime. This should shed some light on the respondents' belief about the extent of criminality in Cyprus. Furthermore, I will be able to investigate in depth the reasons as to why the respondents do not report certain crimes to the authorities.

In question 19 of the questionnaire I have asked all respondents to indicate with a "yes" or a "no" whether in their opinion crime has increased in Cyprus in the last year. Before presenting the survey data I would like to say that official crime statistics of the Cypriot police force show that crime has fluctuated as follows (The statistics refer to reported crime only)

Table 7.1 Number of cases reported to the Cypriot authorities

Official Cypriot Criminal Statistics

| | <u>Year</u> | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <u>Offences</u> | <u>1983</u> | <u>1984</u> | <u>1985</u> |
| 1. Minor offences | 6673 | 6946 | 6042 |
| 2. Serious offences | 2781 | 3095 | 3557 |
| TOTAL | 9454 | 10041 | 9599 |

* Data published by Dept of Research and Statistics.

The above table shows that the increase of minor offences from 1983 to 1984 is only 4.1% while there is a decrease of minor offences from 1984 to 1985 by 13% a significant drop of minor offences being reported. As far as serious offences are concerned, in 1984 there was an

increase of 11.2% in comparison with crime reported in 1983. In 1985 there is an increase of crime reported of 15% in comparison to the amount of crime in 1984. I find that, while there is a drop in the amount of minor offences, on the other hand reported serious offences are on the increase. However, the general observation of the table is that the total amount of reported offences in 1985 is 4.6% less than what it has been reported in 1984. The conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis is that crime has not increased as far as offence reporting is concerned, irrespective of whether the offence is serious or minor.

Perceiving Fluctuation of Crime

Concerning the attitude of the population with reference to whether there is an increase of crime in Cyprus, note Tables 7.2, 7.3., it is shown that the majority of the respondents indicated that there is an increase in the amount of crime in contrast to what official statistics say. Reasons for their opinion will be presented later on.

With reference to difference in responses of sexes it is shown that both groups of sexes have indicated rather highly the assumption that crime has increased.

With reference to age differences, I find that among the 15-29 year olds 82.6% of them said that crime has increased while 14.6% of them said no. The essence of this table is that younger people believe more that crime has risen in comparison with older people. It is equally important to note that more older people refused to give an answer in comparison with younger people.

As far as area of residence is concerned, of those who responded to question 19 I find that among the urban subjects, 80.3% of them indicated a rise of crime in Cyprus, while among rural respondents, the proportion was

only 59.6%. It is evident that among the urban respondents there is a stronger belief that crime has risen than among rural respondents.

Comparing refugee and non-refugee responses to question 19, I find that both groups have indicated very highly an increase of crime. However, among the non-refugees the "no-crime" reading is somewhat greater than among refugees. Overall, the variations are not significant.

The tables show that more elementary-educated respondents said no to crime increase in comparison with secondary and university-educated respondents. I must note that the majority of elementary-educated respondents in this survey are old people, who in an earlier table indicated again very highly a no crime increase. In fact, there is a correlation of responses of variables between age and academic standard.

In detail, the feeling of crime increase is greater among refugees, females, the very young, urban residents, and the highly educated. Each one of these social groups has its own reason and interpretation for the increase in crime.

The females have the feeling that crime has risen on account that lately several publications appeared in the media, highlighting the participation of females in crime in Cyprus. The numbers of rapes that have occurred, as well as a couple of female victims of homicides, have in fact shocked the female population to the extent of not perceiving objectively what is going on around them. Their sense of fear from perception has influenced their attitude in believing that crime has increased.

As far as the attitude younger respondents have on the issue of crime increase, this evolves from the fact that indeed juvenile crime has increased. On top of this, police harassment in discos and public places have made the

youngsters aware of the extent of crime. These two reasons are strong enough to change the youngsters' attitude towards crime, mainly negatively.

With reference to urban respondents who indicated a rise of crime in Cyprus, it is suggested that their attitude is mainly due to the fact that crime is indeed greater in urban areas and the residents in a way perceive what happens around them. Their attitude is formed by what they see happening around them and their experience with crime (i.e. density of the police as well as street crime).

With reference to the refugees, it is suggested that their opinion of an increase in crime is manifested by the fact that indeed crime is greater in the refugee housing estates where the majority of the refugees reside. A similar result was found in an earlier question of the questionnaire enquiring whether police are performing adequately their duty in the neighbourhood. The refugees said "no".

As far as the attitude which various academic groups have on crime increase is concerned, it shows that highly qualified respondents indicated an increase of crime. This on account that secondary and university graduates are young and urbanized respondents (earlier on, these specific social groups indicated an increase of crime for various reasons). On top of this, highly educated respondents are in a position to have an objective view of what goes on in the society as well as being influenced by the media and general literature. Their attitude and opinions are based on the influence of the media, literature and their own conservative views of what goes on in society. On top of these reasons, the majority of highly educated respondents are residents of urban centres where this is a crucial factor in forming the opinion of an increase of crime.

Assumed Reasons for the Fluctuation of Crime

Tables 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 present the responses given by the respondents for question 19b, which refer to the reasons of the assumed increase of crime in Cyprus. Studying these tables I can see that the top three most frequent reasons given by the respondents relate to the following:

- a. Involvement of foreigners in crime (60.5%)
- b. Too much freedom to the youth (18%)
- c. Development and the break-down of morality (17%)

On top of these suggestions, respondents mentioned other reasons which might have contributed to the assumed increase of crime in the country. These reasons are:

- a. Family problems (6.2%)
- b. Civilization (1.6%)
- c. Poverty (2%)
- d. T.V. and Video influence (9.2%)
- e. Bad police policy (4.6%)
- f. Not properly enforcing law and order (3.9%)
- g. Unemployment (7.2%)
- h. Not bringing up children properly (6.5%)
- i. Post-war problems (1974 Turkish invasion) (2%)
- j. Psychological problems (3.9%)
- k. Displacement of the population (refugees) (5.2%)
- l. Other reasons (26.5%)

Before carrying on with the analysis, it is important to note that 146 respondents refused to give an answer (34%). Therefore the above results should be viewed as representative of 66% of the respondents who took part in the survey. A further analysis will show that the overwhelming majority of respondents who did not respond to this question were respondents aged 45-60 year olds. This finding is not a new element because all through the survey I have found that older respondents refrain from expressing

an opinion (i.e. take notice of questions 15 to 18), not wishing to express themselves on account of not wanting to get involved or out of ignorance. As it has been shown in the methodology, it is expected to find high "no responses" from old age people and low social class residents (de Vaus 1991).

Returning to the analysis of the data with reference to the survey variables and the responses they gave, I found that, as far as the first answer of responses is concerned, foreigners are to be blamed for the increase in crime in Cyprus (females have a 52.4% share of the responses while males have a 47.6% share). The above responses are disproportional to the general representation of sexes in the survey. According to the representation in the survey 52% are males and 48% females. Therefore the assumption I made is that females more frequently than males blame foreigners for the increase of crime in Cyprus.

I observe that 71.9% of responses were from respondents who reside in urban areas. Again this figure is disproportional to the representation of urban respondents that took part in the survey. Accordingly, the demographic tables in the methodology show that the urban respondents have a representation of 67% in the survey while the rural respondents 33%. It is therefore quite clear that urban respondents have the distinct opinion that foreigners are to be blamed for the increase of crime in Cyprus.

This notion is quite understandable because city folk see more foreigners and they have a closer association with them. In addition, the actions and dealings of the foreigners are mostly felt by city residents. Recent publications in the media have presented foreigners from the Middle East coming to Cyprus with the sole aim to steal and set up organized crime. This may have shaped the urban

residents' opinion and attitude in believing that all foreigners are criminals. Another issue which has played a role in the above formation of attitude relates to the large inflow of refugees from the Middle East to the island seeking refuge and protection. Cypriots have grown hostile to this inflow because the new refugees bring new cultures and behaviours which the Cypriots find antagonistic, and a threat to the social status.

With reference to the difference of ages of the respondents and their responses, I observe that the 15-29 year olds have a share of 27.6%, the 30-44 year olds have a share in the responses of 36.8% and the 45-60 year olds have a share in the responses of 24.8%. Bearing in mind that there was a high proportion of no answer from older people it is shown that the 30-44 year olds have the highest proportion of responses because their proportion in the survey is only 21.6% while their share of responses is 36.8%. This signifies that middle aged people see the foreigners as responsible for the increase of crime in Cyprus. The above assumption is illusive and perhaps not representative. The high figure of the 30-44 year olds is mainly due to the fact that other age groups have fewer responses than their normal proportions of representation in the survey. As it has already been mentioned, older subjects have a low response figure. In addition, the 15-29 year olds have a low negative response figure on account that young people do associate themselves and rather frequently with foreigners mainly as students in Cypriot Colleges. In conclusion, the 30-44 year olds are not all that negative towards foreigners.

As far as the other variable is concerned, that of displaced respondents, I found that 34.6% of the responses (to the issue of foreigners being responsible for the increase of crime in Cyprus) were made by refugees. I find that this figure is not all that different from the

proportion of refugees in the survey. The share of refugee representation in the survey is 33.5%. This signifies that there is no difference between refugees and non refugees as far as believing that foreigners are responsible for the increase of crime in Cyprus. However, I expected to find a much lower proportion of responses of refugees on account that the refugees live in R.H.E. (Refugee Housing Estates) which are in a way secluded areas with not many foreigners going about. There is an assumption, however, that refugees might have associated their misfortune as the doing of foreigners and in their eyes foreigners are responsible for all wrong doings in the country (it seems this argument goes both ways).

Finally, comparing the various academic groups, I can see that for this specific response the elementary-educated respondents have a share of 38.9%, the secondary-educated respondents have a share of 38.9% while the university-educated respondents have a disproportional share of responses of 22.2%. It is clear that the last academic group has a higher share of responses meaning that university educated respondents mostly believe that the increase of crime in Cyprus is mainly due to foreigners. I find that the representation of university graduates in the survey is only 9%. The reasons for such attitude are based on the fact that Cypriot graduates are educated abroad (mainly Greece, England and United States) where crime, as the residents of those countries believe, is manifested by foreigners. Cypriot graduates are somehow influenced by what British and Americans believe about their criminality and in a way are biassed in what they believe about Cypriot criminality. The above statement is an assumption trying to explain a certain social attitude rather than a rule.

Forms of Crime which Fluctuate

In the previous sections I have mainly enquired about the fluctuation of crime in Cyprus in general terms. In question 20 of the questionnaire I expand the issue by enquiring about the form of criminality considered by the respondents as having increased within the last year. I must point that the present data refers to those respondents who indeed have pointed out that crime has increased. From the previous tables I find that only 73.5% of the sample has indicated that crime has indeed risen. In conclusion, the responses to question 20 refer only to 76% of the sample of interviewees including "Don't knows". To verify the above figures, note Tables 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9 the number of respondents that did not respond to question 20. In all, 24% of the sample did not give an answer. This figure is within the logical perspectives because a number of respondents which previously had refused to give an answer to question 19 have decided now to respond to question 20. It is shown that older respondents 45-60 years olds, or 11.7% of the total sample did not respond. It is quite clear throughout this study that older people are refraining and refusing to give an answer on matters requiring an expression of opinion or attitude.

Tables 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9 present a list of crimes considered as having increased within the year before. Table 7.7 presents the total results while Tables 7.8 and 7.9 present them in terms of responses per sex, academic level, displacement, and place of residence. The most frequent forms of crime considered as having increased within the last year are:

Table 7.10. Crime that has risen according to the responses received.

| Number | Offence | % of Response |
|--------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1. | Theft | 39.4 |
| 2. | Homicide | 18.6 |
| 3. | Rape | 12.9 |
| 4. | Burglary | 10.8 |
| 5. | Narcotics | 5.2 |
| 6. | Sexual | 3.9 |
| 7. | Traffic | 2.9 |
| 8. | Robbery | 1.5 |
| 9. | Explosion | 1.2 |
| 10. | Hooliganism | 0.6 |
| 11. | Criminal damage | 0.5 |
| 12. | Smuggling | 0.5 |
| 13. | Other | <u>2.0</u> |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 |

Respondents gave more than one answer as a response to question number 20 of the questionnaire.

But how justifiable are the above attitudes concerning crime fluctuation as registered in Cypriot criminal statistics? The B.C.S. (1984) Maxfield (1987) and Box et al 1988) have produced alarmingly high estimates of crime rates far in excess of actual risks. As with most surveys of this kind, the main measures of F.D.C were the extent to which people worry about becoming a victim and the anxiety felt about their personal safety in various situations. It was women, the elderly and those from lower income households who were the most worried and felt most unsafe.

Table 7.11: Fluctuation of crime reported to the Cypriot authorities between 1984-85

Official Cypriot Criminal Statistics.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Offences</u> | <u>Cases Reported</u> | | <u>% of Fluctuation</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | | 1984 | 1985 | |
| 1. | Theft | 2425 | 2851 | +17.6 |
| 2. | Homicide | 8 | 6 | -25.0 |
| 3. | Rape | 2 | 3 | +50.0 |
| 4. | Burglary | 917 | 1102 | +20.2 |
| 5. | Narcotics | 52 | 54 | +4.0 |
| 6. | Sexual | 32 | 23 | -28.1 |
| 7. | Traffic | 46027 | 49728 | +8.0 |
| 8. | Robbery | 13 | 11 | -15.4 |
| 9. | Explosion | 15 | 17 | +13.3 |
| 10. | Hooliganism* | - | - | - |
| 11. | Criminal damage | 220 | 315 | +43.2 |
| 12. | Smuggling | - | - | - |

* No such crime in statutory criminal law in Cyprus.

The above table was formulated from the annual criminal statistics of Cyprus for the years 1984 and 1985 numbers 11 and 12.

There are a number of discrepancies as far as the attitude of the respondents is concerned in terms of crime fluctuation in the country. As far as thefts are concerned, the respondents' perception is quite justifiable because on record there is indeed an increase in the number of cases reported, i.e. 17.6%. However, as far as homicides are concerned, the respondents have overestimated the extent of crime. During 1985, there was a drop by 2 cases or 25%. The most determining factor in this case is the extended coverage by the media of those homicides that took place in Cyprus. Most specifically the Esther Perlaki

and the Antri Myliotou cases. Both women were killed in the most horrifying way. The Cypriot media gave (and still give) an extended coverage to these murders creating an uproar by the feminist movement. In a sense, this move has spread fear and concern over the female population in Cyprus on the basis that females are under pressure and threatened by males. In the above cases the assailants were husband and lover to the victims. In a seminar given for the Socialist Women's Forum early in 1986, I produced data which showed that in proportion Cyprus has 3 murders per 1.000.000 female population, while for the same proportion of population in the United States the figure was around 3.9. Indeed there is an issue to argue concerning the extent of female victimization. But what is noticeable is that the above figure is representative of 1985 alone.

Other years have shown much less criminality in respect of homicides in general. Therefore the fear produced is unjustifiable. It is believed that the media bears the responsibility for the creation of fear within the female population.

As far as rapes are concerned, 12.9% of the respondents have indicated that there has been an increase of cases of rapes in Cyprus within the last year. Although there has been an increase of rapes by only 1 case, this does not justify the worry of the population that rapes are on the increase. Certainly there have been numerous cases presented in the newspapers but these have either never been substantiated or dismissed at court.

It is interesting to note that all cases of rape involve foreign tourists as victims. In a seminar that I gave to the S.K.A.L. club in Nicosia at the Hilton on the 2nd October 1985, I produced evidence which showed that from 1982 to July 1985 there had been 13 cases of rape and 8 cases of attempted rape in the whole of Cyprus. These are figures published by the police department. Ten cases

involved foreign victims-tourists while the remaining 3 were Cypriots. Out of the 8 attempted rape cases reported, 2 involved foreign victims while the remaining 6 involved Cypriot victims. It must be noted that all assailants were Cypriots. In a special survey that I have conducted for the seminar for the Tourist Organization (SKAL CLUB) I asked as to "why do you think we have rapes in Cyprus? What are the reasons?" Briefly the results that I received were as follows:

Table 7.12: Causes of rape in Cyprus.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Reasons</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Provocation | 58.0 |
| 2. | Sexual immaturity | 16.0 |
| 3. | Sexual abnormality | 11.0 |
| 4. | Lower level of education | 8.0 |
| 5. | No free sex | 5.0 |
| 6. | Porno movies | 1.0 |
| 7. | No deterrent punishment | <u>1.0</u> |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 |

The majority of the respondents declared that rapes in Cyprus are due to or are rather the results of provocation by the females. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that as many females as males expressed the same opinion on provocation. But how justifiable is the attitude of the people that participated in this mini survey considering that rape in Cyprus is the result of provocation? In the above mentioned seminar I presented two reasons which led to such attitude formation.

a) Cypriot Mentality: It is true that Cypriots live in a male dominated, conservative society on the verge of social changes. Large numbers of the population which have

been affected by industrialization, urbanization and forceful displacement have established a more liberal attitude to life which antagonizes the old values and mentality. People in society were not given the chance to adopt to the new evolving society as the case might be (Organic Solidarity), Durkheim, and in a way this has led to confusion as far as morality is concerned. In a matter of 3 to 5 years the people of Cyprus were forced to accept new situations totally strange to them. Large foreign investment programmes on the island made it possible for the Cypriots to increase their income per capita. Additional investments have increased the tourist industry. Up to two million tourists will visit Cyprus in the following year, almost three times as much as the population of the island. The tourist industry has brought to Cyprus a sense of (a) Xenomania and simultaneously Xenophobia (b) Tolerance to foreign ways of life.

All the above sudden changes have brought a state of confusion in their morality and mentality. The confusion is between accepting and maintaining the old traditional values or instead the new money-making, liberal values forced upon them. Nevertheless, although liberalism was forced upon the Cypriots, this has not evolved through sociological development. In a sense, the Cypriots are missing some sociological qualities or links between past and present.

The issue I am trying to make here, which is indeed a generalization and refers to all walks of life in Cyprus, is that when tourists arrive on the island, they see around them a westernized culture comparable to any other European country. This is a false perception because Cypriots have to put on a face for the sake of tourism but underneath everything is crumbling. But how does this sociological discussion affect rape cases in Cyprus? I must note that the Cypriot Organization for Tourism in a way promotes

Cyprus as the island where tourists can come and enjoy the three S's. These are Sea, Sun, Sex. The promotions are in terms of advertising which picture indirectly what Cyprus offers. Tourists indeed come to Cyprus to enjoy the three S's. As a consequence, the beaches are full of nudists who, in the Cypriot eyes, are a simple provocation. Although this is forbidden by law, the state turns a blind eye to them for the sake of the tourist industry. The church and conservatives do apply pressure on the state but this is not enough, it does not outweigh the profits. In essence, Cypriots associate tourist liberalism and behaviour with sex: a topless female on the beach, a sociable dance at the disco, a lonely holiday maker, an adventure camper etc., mislead the Cypriots into believing that their company is welcome. It is quite true to say that often Cypriots misunderstand sexual signals and intentions. Rape is the result of these misunderstandings.

b) Tourists and Tourism industry in general: A general observation of the tourist inflow per sex per country to the island shows that the majority of tourists are women (Scandinavian countries only).

Table 7.13: Tourists entering Cyprus per sex.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Country</u> | <u>Females (%)</u> | <u>Males (%)</u> |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Sweden | 59 | 41 |
| 2. | Norway | 58 | 42 |
| 3. | Switzerland | 55 | 45 |
| 4. | Austria | 52 | 48 |

From C.T.O. annual report 1985

More female tourists come to Cyprus than males. All of these tourists have an average stay of 11 days (more than any other ethnic group). Evidently, in Cyprus there is a flooding of female tourists, as far as the European countries are concerned. The female tourist density is more evident at the Famagusta and Larnaca holiday resorts. Incidentally, in Famagusta and Larnaca there were 5 rape reports in Limassol 4 and Nicosia and Paphos 2 each. It is inevitable that due to their long stay, some of the tourists will decide to associate and mix with the local population. Again rape is the result of bad communication and intention.

Although a distant thought, can it not be contemplated that the female tourists come to Cyprus also for sexual adventures? What is the evidence? Certainly sex is one of the incentives offered by all tourist boards all over the world. The Philipppines have attracted large numbers of male tourists during the sex film festival. Various Spanish and Greek islands offer similar attractions. Some British newspaper clippings have labelled Cyprus as the island of sin. Can it be true to say that some female tourists do not just come to Cyprus to see its natural beauties but also its "sexual attractions"? Young army conscripts flood holiday resorts every summer on the understanding that they will find company.

Tourists are not seen as passive agents because evidence shows that, up to a certain extent, they provoke and instigate sexual relationships. I must note that in all rape cases the assailant was known to the victim. On the other hand, the tourists are blameless because, one can assume they do not know better (i.e. they are not familiar or aware of the sexual mentality of the Cypriots. This derives out of the confusion that exists in the culture as far as morality and inhibition are concerned). Recent police investigations have shown that certain tourist rape

victims were holding "rape insurance" i.e. were insured against rape. Some of these cases were not brought to court on account of false statements by the victims. Therefore, there is another explanation why some tourist rape victims come forward to report their victimization, or assumed crime.

With reference to burglaries, it is shown that in the survey 10.8% of the sample indicated that there had been an increase of the above offence. Indeed criminal statistics show that from 1984 to 1985 there had been an increase in the number of cases reported by 20.2%. The above figures show that the Cypriots are truly aware of the increase of this particular offence because, year after year, more Cypriots are victims of burglaries. Recent publications in the media have shown that foreign gangs come to Cyprus with the aim to attack Cypriots. On top of this, Cypriot criminal elements become more organized in burglaries. Another issue which is rather alarming, as far as burglaries are concerned, is the fact that Turks and Turkish Cypriots cross the demilitarized zone into the Greek Cypriot sector and commit a number of crimes including burglaries.

" A combination of the economic differential between two countries and attempts to impose various kinds of border controls can in some circumstances constitute an opportunity for criminal activity" (Vagg 1992 p. 310).

The Turkish criminals present a problem to the Cypriot police because of the sensitivity of the issue. A number of cases have been reported at Ayios Pavlos, Vorios Polos and the villages of Nisou, Athienou and Lymbia which are situated along the so called "Green Line". The most frequent items that all burglars steal are presented in a previous chapter. These mainly include household items,

stereophonic and personal valuables.

With reference to the remaining offences, figures are too small to make any valid argument. For instance narcotics have increased only by two cases, robberies decreased by 2 cases, explosions decreased by 2 cases. For the above offences I cannot make any serious deductions because increases and decreases of cases reported, as well as attitude readings, are very low and I cannot say with certainty that these values present issues for discussion.

What is interesting, however, is the fact that although traffic offences have increased by 8%, only 2.9% of the sample pointed that there is an increase in traffic offences. Perhaps this, was expected because the question of the survey asked for crime fluctuation. Respondents might have confused traffic offences and crime. Although traffic offences are a major headache for the Cypriot police, Cypriots do not consider it as such. The concern of homicides, thefts, rapes, and burglaries override this major offence which is a problem for everyone. Perhaps the daily bulletins of the police on the radio in a way reassure the public that everything is under control. In these police bulletins police public relations officers advise the public on current traffic issues. This shows to the public how concerned the police are with traffic offences. Besides, traffic offences do not linger in the public's mind so much as a horrifying murder or rape.

Having presented a rather general picture of Cypriot attitude on crime fluctuation, I will try now to present in synoptic terms the attitude of Cypriots in relation to the variables studied.

With reference to theft offences, it is shown that 50.6% of the responses were made by females despite the fact that their demographic representation is 48% of the sample. In essence, this means that more women than men believe that theft offences are on the increase. However,

due to the fact that the proportional difference between percentage of the expressed attitude and proportion of sex is not that great, I would like to stress that these results should be received with a degree of scepticism.

As far as the age variable is concerned, I observe that there is no significant difference among the three age groups in so far as believing that theft offences have increased significantly. Their respective shares of attitude are 34%, 28.2% and 37.8% while their demographic representations are 33.4%, 29.1% and 37.4%.

In relation to the location of residence of the respondents in the sample, I observe that 77.2% of the people who have said that thefts have increased within the last year come from urban areas. The significant point for this is that the proportion of urban residents in the survey is only 67.2%. This signifies that the majority of the people who have said that thefts have increased come from urban areas. This is quite understandable because most of the thefts that take place in Cyprus occur in urban areas and the residents of these areas are quite aware of it.

Comparing refugees' and non-refugees' responses, I observe that there is no significant difference between these two groups as far as suggesting that thefts are on the increase. A 33.2% of the responses come from refugees whose proportion in the survey is 33.5% of the sample. This signifies that both groups have rated equally theft as being on the increase.

Finally, with reference to the academic variable, I observe that among the three levels of education of the respondents, the university graduate respondents rated very highly thefts as being on the increase. Their perspective ratio is 37.8% of all responses while their demographic proportion is only 9.1% of the sample. This signifies that, overwhelmingly, university graduates believed that thefts

had in one way or another increased within the year before.

In conclusion, the answer to the question as to what groups of respondents estimated rightly the fluctuation in the increase of the number of thefts reported, are: females, urban residents, and university graduates.

In explaining the above answer, I suppose that females have indicated an increase in thefts because they stay more at home and are able to detect, hear, and experience thefts that occur in the household. Note that the majority of the thefts that take place are associated with household goods. Secondary educated urban residents experience more thefts because the overwhelming majority of such offences occur in urban areas. The university graduates have overwhelmingly pointed out that thefts are on the increase because it is assumed that they are more concerned with law and order or because the graduates reside mostly in urban areas, thus experiencing more crime, or because the university sample are respondents employed as teachers, lawyers, and economists who might be more informed about issues concerning law and order.

Concerning homicides, it is shown that the female respondents who assumed an increase of homicides within the last year represent 58.2% of all respondents. Their demographic proportion is 48% of the sample. This suggests that more women than men believe that homicides are on the increase. This is quite justifiable because previously I showed that within the year before a number of females had been murdered in a horrifying manner and their cases were much published in the media. Although there has been a drop in the number of homicides from 1984 to 1985, it is shown that females have the attitude that murders are on the increase. This shows that females are concerned as well as anxious about the latest homicides. In a way, fear has besieged the female population in a way that makes them believe that homicides have increased.

Considering the variable of age, it is shown that 43.4% of the responses come from young people (i.e. age 15-29 year olds). Their demographic representation is only 33.5% of the total sample. This signifies that more young people than older people believe that homicides have increased. This is, of course, a subjective view because young people do not have the experience of the past to make comparisons with. Older people remember how it was during the 30s and 40s when there were 50 murders per year (Cliford 1954a) or during the 50s and 60s when Cyprus was drowned in blood due to E.O.K.A. activity and bicomunal conflicts. For this reason alone, older people are not impressed by the total number of murders that occur nowadays in Cyprus.

I note that urban residents mostly believe that homicides are on the increase. A total of 79.5% of the responses were made by urban residents while their demographic representation in the study is 67.2%. For the same reasons as previously stated, the urban respondents have a first hand experience because most of the homicides that have occurred in Cyprus were in urban areas. Neighbourhood talking as well as publicity in the media have brainwashed the urban residents in believing that murders are on the increase.

When observing the differences in the amount of responses between refugees and non-refugees, I observe that the former have a slight lead in the total number of people that have expressed the opinion that homicides have increased within the last year. Their share of demographic representation is 33.5% of the sample while their proportion in the said expressed attitude is 36.1%. Although it is widely understood that refugees are undergoing an assimilation process in the society, some people still bear the scars of the 1974 war and their attitudes towards killing are somewhat affected and biassed

when it comes to evaluating the extent of homicides in Cyprus.

Considering the evaluation of the expressed attitude in comparison with the three different academic groups, it is shown again that the university graduates have this time overestimated the extent of homicides in Cyprus. Whereas their demographic representation in the survey is only 9.1% their share in the expressed attitude (that homicides have increased within the last year) is 28%. This is a significant reading which suggests that university graduates are overestimating the extent of the homicides in Cyprus. Perhaps, if I study the previous trends of theft, I can draw the general conclusion that university graduates generally believe that crime is on the increase in Cyprus.

So, what kind of people in fact have overestimated the extent of homicides in Cyprus? In synoptic terms these are: Females, young people, urban residents, refugees, and university graduates.

Studying the issue of rape cases in Cyprus, it is shown that females have a 55.3% share of the responses while their proportion in the census is 48%. Without any doubt females consider that the number of cases have increased. Although there is an increase from 2 to 3, this does not justify the attitude women have for this crime, because crime figures are too low to be noticeable. As an explanation, I point to the effect of the media and general coverage of rape cases. When a case of rape or indeed a murder or other noticeable offence takes place, the media spend a lot of time and coverage either during investigation or during the trial. Daily bulletins over-emphasize the facts. Nothing much is happening in Cyprus and such bulletins add the spice to journalism.

With reference to age variation in the responses, I note that the 15-29 year old group and 30-44 year old group have overestimated the extent of rapes in Cyprus. It is

evident that these two groups together total 3/4 of the population of Cyprus (adult). In essence, it means that the majority of people in Cyprus have the attitude that rapes are on the increase. I have already mentioned the reasons for this effect.

Comparing attitudes of urban and rural respondents on the above issue, I note that overwhelmingly the urban respondents have a share of 89.4% of all responses. This indicates that rapes have increased within the last year. It seems that urban respondents are overconcerned with this antisocial behaviour. However, another view suggests that rural respondents, either because they do not realize the extent of such offences or because they do not give much emphasis on the issue or because of the concern of other priorities affecting them, or because they do not experience such crimes did not consider rapes as having increased within the last year.

Refugees have a 37.6% share of the responses which is somewhat greater of their demographic representation. However, due to the fact that the difference is very small, I cannot make a significant assumption on this variable.

As far as education is concerned, it seems there is the same pattern as previously found when studying other types of criminality. The most overrepresented group is that of the university graduate respondents who believe overwhelmingly that rapes are on the increase. A 23.5% of those responses made about the assumed increase of rape cases within the year before come from university graduates. I believe that the reasons explaining this effect have already been mentioned above.

In summary, the groups of people who overestimated the extent of rapes in Cyprus are: Females, people aged up to 44, urban residents, refugees, and university graduates.

With reference to burglaries as a specific offence, it is shown that there has been a 20.2% increase in the cases

reported to the authorities. From the above tables I observe that both sexes have registered almost equally the rate of burglaries. Although more males than females have expressed this feeling, I cannot say that this varies significantly because figures are too low to draw any conclusion.

Comparing the age groups of the respondents, I find that 52.1% of the responses were made by respondents aged 15-29 years who represent 33.5% of the sample. This signifies that more young people than older believe that burglaries are on the increase. Although I have shown previously that there is no major difference in the responses among the three age groups as far as increase in theft is concerned, it is evident that young people state that burglaries are on the increase. The reason for their awareness, and if one might say anxiety, derives perhaps from the fact that burglars affect mostly the young ones. Burglars steal household items mostly enjoyed by the young people in the household. An analogy to the above reasoning would be if one asks old people to tell whether they consider thefts of pension cheques as a major offence which is on the increase. Taking an educated guess, I imagine that older people would say yes to the increase of such offences because this is closer to them than other types of offences.

With reference to the responses made by urban and rural residents, it is shown that 90.1% of the responses recorded were made by urban residents. This shows that urban residents are more aware of burglaries because more, if not all of the burglaries, take place in urban and suburban areas.

Concerning refugees and non-refugees, it is shown that 50.7% of all responses relating to the increase of burglaries within the year before were made by refugees. Bearing in mind that the majority of the refugees in the

survey sample come from R.H.E. I can attribute their evaluation to this offence because in the R.H.E. (as I have already shown) criminality is somewhat greater than in other residential areas. This alone makes the refugees more aware of burglaries than other non-refugee residents.

Considering a comparison of the three academic groups with the referred responses, I note that the same trend observed for previous responses is also evident for this offence as well. Still, the university graduates have the most disproportional share of the attitudes expressed (i.e. 31% of the attitudes that pointed out that burglaries are on the increase were reported by university graduates). It seems that university graduates have consistently considered crime as having increased in all forms. I have already stated the reasons.

In conclusion, the groups of people that have considered rightly the extent of burglaries are: young people, people aged 15-29 years, urban residents, refugees and university graduates.

From the above presentation of responses which consider thefts, homicides, rapes, and burglaries as having increased within the year before, I can draw the conclusion that the most aware groups of respondents about the extent of criminality in Cyprus are: females, urban residents, refugees, university graduate and to some extent, young people. However, what aids evaluation of criminality? Davis (1952), Roshier (1973), Ditton and Duffy (1983) reported the distorted impression created by the high proportion of reports of violent crimes. Booth (1970), Hall (1966) suggested the serial learning theory which states that items incongruent, large, or emotional are easily recalled.

Going through Tables 7.7, 7.8, 7.9 it is shown that there are other noticeable offences being mentioned as having increased within the year before, but because they represent only 18.3% of all responses given I cannot make

any objective assumption. This is because the responses for the offences which have been mentioned are very few and not representative or significant. However the offences which have been mentioned are:

Table 7.14 Additional offences reported showing an increasing trend.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Offence</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Narcotics | 5.2 |
| 2. | Sexual | 3.9 |
| 3. | Traffic Offences | 2.9 |
| 4. | Robbery | 1.5 |
| 5. | Explosion | 1.2 |
| 6. | Hooliganism | 0.6 |
| 7. | Criminal damage | 0.5 |
| 8. | Smuggling | 0.5 |
| 9. | Other | 2.0 |

It is interesting to note that although criminal damage offences increased from 1984 to 1985 by 43.2%, the respondents did not give much emphasis on this form of criminality as if it is of no concern to them. Indeed, Cypriot police spend much time to combat criminal damage offences either on property or livestock.

The same thing can be said about traffic offences. Although there has been an increase of 8% of the cases reported to the authorities only 2.9% of the responses referred to traffic offences.

Table 7.15: Crime reported by sex as far as crime increase is concerned.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Offence</u> | <u>Males%</u> | <u>Females %</u> |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1. | Theft | 39.0 | 39.8 |
| 2. | Burglary | 11.6 | 10.0 |
| 3. | Homicide | 15.6 | 21.0 |
| 4. | Rape | 11.6 | 14.0 |
| 5. | Traffic | 3.4 | 2.4 |
| 6. | Narcotics | 6.4 | 4.0 |
| 7. | Sexual | 4.9 | 3.0 |
| 8. | Other | 7.5 | 5.8 |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 |

According to Table 7.15, I note that males have referred to burglaries, traffic offences, drugs, sexual and other noticeable offences as being on the increase in comparison with the females who have considered theft, homicide, and rape as having increased. It is observed that Cypriot women are most concerned or let us say, anxious with the physical nature of crime in comparison to the Cypriot males who are concerned with more materialistically oriented offences.

For the keen sociologist, this is interpreted as showing the Cypriot woman's concern about the social values, uncertainty of her role in society, civil rights, unsafety, etc., while the males are concerned mostly about materialistically oriented crimes which show concern for pluralism, egalitarianism, authoritarianism and, to some extent, alienation from the rest of the society. All these characteristics are neither new nor heard for the first time. These are the cultural facts that endorse the Cypriot culture.

7.3 PERCEIVED REMEDIES TO THE CRIME ISSUE

This section states the assumed (suggested) measures the government should take in order to combat the assumed crime increase in the country. Tables 7.16, 7.17, 7.18 present the responses respondents gave with reference to the above question. It is shown that the most frequent answers respondents gave relate to:

- a. The state should be strict (32.4%)
- b. Severe penal sentences (28.5%)
- c. Educate the youth accordingly (15.5%)

Subjects reported other measures which are less frequent than the ones mentioned above. These are:

- a. Enforcement of law and order properly (4.6%)
- b. More police patrols (12.1%)
- c. Control the inflow of foreigners (8.9%)
- d. Educate the public (8.9%)
- e. Better police policy (12.8%)
- f. More police interest (3.6%)
- g. Improve social services (2.5%)
- h. Other (15.7%)

Before going on with the analysis it is worth stressing that 149 respondents or a proportion of 34.7% did not respond to this question. It is worth noticing that almost half of those subjects who did not respond to the question were aged 45-60 years. Like the previous questions I find the same form of behaviour from the older respondents.

With reference to the most frequent answer to question 21, I observe that males have a 48.4% proportion of the answers while females have a 51.6% proportion of the answers. Although there is a difference in the proportion of responses this cannot be considered as very significant. However, the results verify the fact that

females are more conscious of crime in Cyprus than males who, in effect, consider themselves threatened. Their responses suggest that the state should be more alert and strict with offenders. This is quite understandable because there is foundation of their fear of victimization (note previous explanation for this effect).

With reference to the above response in relation to age variation, it is shown that 48.4% of the answers were made by the age group of 15-29 year olds, 29.7% of the answers were made by the age group of 30-44 year olds while the remaining 21.9% by the age group of 45-60 years olds. Young respondents have an overwhelmingly disproportional representation in the answers of question 21. It is, therefore, true to say that young respondents have the opinion that the state should treat offenders more strictly; the same goes with the government's policy. This opinion is derived from the fact that young respondents are aware of the fact that their age group is more criminal than other age groups. Their awareness might be the result of continuous misinformation and influence by the media (note Cypriot Criminal Statistics 1985 pp. 96 Table 62 which shows that juvenile delinquency has increased from 1984 to 1985 by 16% for serious offences while from 1984 to 1985 a decrease for minor offences by 19.1%). The reason why the young respondents stated that there should be more strictness with the offenders derives from the assumption that the Cypriot youths really do not behave according to cultural rules. There is rebellion and rejection which are the results of conflict in moral values and conflict in the opportunities towards wealth (note Durkheim and Merton). The reason why the young ones should be treated strictly is perhaps the result of the understanding made by the society and the media that they enjoy many liberties, without giving actually anything in return. I have specified the young here because, as it is noted from previous pages, it

is juvenile delinquency that has increased lately (to be specific between 1984 to 1985 by 16.8% of the total reporting).

With reference to the area of residence of the respondents and what they have answered, it is shown that 76.9% of the answers come from respondents from urban areas. The remaining 23.1% of the responses come from respondents from the rural areas. Bearing in mind the demographic representation of the two area groups it is shown that more answers for strictness have come from urban areas 76.9% as opposed to 67% which are the normal proportions of answers in the survey. Definitely, urban respondents believe that the state should be more firm with offenders. This is due to the fact that the urban population experiences more victimization than the rural population.

Recent publications in the media have made the population (the ones most affected by crime) to believe that offenders are not punished firmly. Another dimension which is applicable to all variables is the attitude that suggests that the state is not acting firmly with regard to law enforcement. This means that government bodies and organizations such as the police are not acting firmly to stop crime.

With reference to the responses made by the refugees and non-refugees, it is noted that 51.6% of the answers were given by refugees. This signifies that more refugees than non-refugees said that they prefer to see the state and the family taking a stricter line in combating crime increase. It should be noted that the representation of the refugees in the survey is only 33.5%. The reason for the preference of the refugees to state that they like to see stricter measures in combating crime lies with the fact that in the R.H.E. (where the majority of refugees live) crime is on the increase (note Endoscopisi March 1986)

where it was shown from a study of comparison of Social Enquiry Reports of refugees and non-refugees that R.H.E. have more crime than other residential areas). The essence is that the refugees believe that the government should take a tougher line because law and order are out of hand in the R.H.E. which is mainly due to the absence of (a) the police and (b) a consistent social structure to initiate crime control mechanisms.

With reference to the academic standard of those respondents who said that the state should combat crime by becoming more firm, 47.3% of the responses came from primary-educated respondents, 29.7% of the responses came from secondary-educated subjects, while the remaining 23% came from university-educated subjects. The essence of the above data presentation is that in proportion more university-educated respondents said that the state should be stricter with criminals.

7.4 DISCUSSION

Having established the police position in the society as well as the public's satisfaction with policing methods, and, in addition, presented the low levels of crime recorded as well as hidden crime, I believe it is necessary to enquire about the evaluation of criminality as presented by the Cypriots. It is also crucial to present the Cypriots' perception of the patterns and magnitude of crime because this can establish the level of awareness of crime in the country. This will assist in formulating preventive measures in order to combat crime adequately.

Such investigation will provide information concerning the fear of the Cypriots about crime and victimization as well as to what measures should be taken in order to fight crime adequately: In other words, to point to the direction the Cypriot government should direct its policing effort in the future. The issue here relates to government

measures only. This does not mean that society is blameless for its part in regulating crime.

To begin with, the Cypriots have overestimated crime increase as well as crime patterns in Cyprus. This is not new to international contemporary crime evaluation or fear of crime. The possible consequences of fear are numerous (Box et al 1986); it fractures the sense of community and in general collective conscience (Durkheim); fear transforms some public places into no-go areas (Morgan 1978; Wilson 1975). The more prosperous citizens, because of fear, protect themselves and property or move neighbourhood (Sampson and Wooldredge 1986). As a consequence, crime may be displaced on to those already suffering from other social and economic disadvantages (Lea and Young 1984). Fear also reduces the appeal of liberal penal policies, such as decarceration and punishment (Cullen et al 1985; Hough 1985; Langworthy and Whitehead 1986).

The current study endorses the consequences of fear on the grounds that Cypriots demand that the police should use strict methods of policing and the courts to issue harsher sentences. Furthermore, fear creates a seed-bed of discontent from which vigilante justice might flourish and thus undermine the legitimacy of the criminal justice system, particularly when courts are seen as being soft, displaying more compassion for the offender than the victim (Scheingold 1984). People afraid of being criminally victimised change their habits (Carofalo 1981; Krahn and Kennedy 1985; Riger et al 1982; Skogan 1986). People also tend to stay at home more, in surroundings they have made safer with locks, chains, bars and alarms. Research has identified four groups who fall into this vulnerability category. The old (Antunes et al 1977; Baldassare 1986; Braugart et al 1980; Clarke and Lewis 1982; Giles-Sims 1984; Jaycox 1978; Jefford 1983; Miethe and Lee 1984; Yin

1980, 1982); women (Gordon et al 1980; Riger 1978; Warr 1984, 1985); the poor and ethnic minorities (Baumer 1985; Taylor and Hale 1986). People without friends in the neighbourhood (Hartnagel 1979) will fear more. The absence of friends might be mitigated where people perceived that their neighbours helped each other, thus creating a strong sense of neighbourhood cohesion and community (Kennedy and Silverman 1985a, 1985b; Silverman and Kennedy 1985). Fear is also the result of a run down neighbourhood (Baumer 1985; Hunter 1987; Hunter and Baumer 1982; Lewis and Maxfield 1980; Maxfield 1984; Taylor and Hale 1986; Wilson and Kelling 1982).

However, if police are effective and efficient in clearing up crime, and they respond to calls quickly and they have physical presence on the ground, then the public is less likely to fear crime (Baker et al 1983; Krahn and Kennedy 1985). Box (et al 1988) suggests that fear of crime is a factor of:

".... two points of possible intervention emerge (environmental conditions and confidence in the police) (Box et al 1988 p.352).

I can identify two reasons for the effect of fear in Cyprus.

- a. Moral Panic
- b. Experiencing victimization or fear of crime.

a. Moral panic: It develops when the individual receives messages from his environment forcing him to believe that he or his welfare is threatened. Hall et al (1978), analysing moral panic, suggest that this sustains social institutions. I wish to referring to the influence of the media as well as the influence of contemporary social development on existing social norms and values.

Citizens learn about crime from the media. (Baker et al 1983; Garofalo 1981; Heath 1984).

It is true to say that the Cypriot media, including radio, T.V. and newspapers, act more as a local news agency rather than international news channels. The mass media also give a great deal of attention to the police, including fictional programming (Reiner 1985) and in news reporting (Erickson 1989). Routine news reporting aid public relations, promotion, function and crime discourse (Fishman 1980,1981) including reporting of crime events and features such as 'Crime stoppers'. The police are presented as the major agent in crime fighting (Carriere and Ericson 1989). Although most police work is routine, the media dramatize it and give it a ceremonial force (Schattenburg 1981). T.V. coverage shows that police are quite effective in fighting crime (March 1988) and because they foster a sympathetic, effective response in people towards what is seen as dangerous work requiring heroic effort (Gunter and Wober 1988). Also T.V. movies (note Starsky and Hutch) which show conflict between police officers and their police superiors and the need to violate rules to get the job done, become the norm (Fiske 1987, Macauley 1987).

For these reasons, the media are inclined to sensationalise local news in order to be in a competitive position. Indeed, crime is one of those issues that provide sensationalism. Research has shown that the media sensualize the issue of Crime (Schlesinjer and Howear 1993). In the 'hypodermic model' a simple injection of media messages is said to result in a quick fix that affects attitudes and actions. (Berkowitz 1970; Liebert and Buron 1972; Tannenbaum and Zillman 1975; Parke et al 1977). A sustained dose of bad material over a long period is said to result in a kind of symbolic addiction with behavioural consequences. Heavy exposure cultivates a fear in people for their own safety along with a distrust of others

(Gerbner and Gross 1976; Gerbner et al 1977, 1978, 1979; O'Keefe 1984).

Another explanation concerning the drive by press men to exploit news is that made by the editor of the Daily Telegraph, The Right Hon. William Deedes who, when addressing the association of Chief Police Officers some years ago said:

"The press is not in business primarily to foster public confidence in public administration, in the police, in politicians or in any institution however admirable. Disclosure is its business and, in fairness, that not only sells newspapers but is often conducive to the public good" (Alderson 1979 p. 102).

Cases such as murder, rape, drug trafficking, threatening public figures etc receive undue publicity, actually more than it is needed. Crime reporting in the media creates a distorted picture of reality which is reflected in the beliefs of news consumers (Roshier 1973; Mayer 1973; Winkel and Vrig 1990; March 1991). It is also true to say that fear sells (Humphries 1981; Fishman 1978; Lichtenstein et al 1978). The relationship of newspapers, crime reporting and fear of crime is shown as follows:

"Exposure to mass media is therefore not a source of distorted thoughts and bad behaviour, as the 'evil causes evil' fallacy has it, but a means of constituting and articulating attitudes to and versions of crime, law and justice" (Ericson 1991 p. 242).

Often cases are developing into soap operas. Daily bulletins of police investigation as well as giving reference to names of both offender and victim attract the interest of the public to ask for more because somehow

these people either by kinship or location might be acquainted with them (note kinship, co-villagers, belonging to the same political party, comradeship etc). The cases which the Cypriots feel sensitive and strongly about are those which contradict and challenge the values and the level of morality. These receive more publicity than others. Such cases are prostitution, homosexuality, incest, murder etc. It is a frequent event in the summer to read in the Cypriot newspapers cases of rape involving female tourists and Cypriot taxi drivers or Cypriot waiters. Often these publications last for days and weeks. Once the police investigations have been completed, then it is the turn of court proceedings. In essence, there is a repetition of the news. This can go on and on until the court delivers a ruling. Even then, newspapers or magazines will present summaries or off the record findings.

Because of the above reasons, the Cypriot media, especially the newspapers as well as magazines, have daily or weekly bulletins referring to crime. In a way this conditions the Cypriots' attitude in believing that there is constant criminality all over the place. Moore and Trganowicz (1988) argue that reasonable fears concerning crime can be harnessed to fight the threat of crime, but when these fears become unreasonable, they amount to a counterproductive response and become a problem.

A number of assumptions should be taken into consideration as far as the effect of media is concerned.

"The mass media and especially television are the main sources of people's understanding of crime and legal control" (Robinson and Levy 1986 p.159).

However, research indicates that people learn about crime and legal control from a wide variety of other

sources, that the mass media are but one source among many (Craber 1980, 1984).

It is accepted that the mass media transmit distorted information about crime and legal control (Dominick 1973; Gerbner and Gross 1976; Graber 1979; Humphries 1981; Sheley and Ashkins 1981; Fedler and Jordan 1982; Lichter and Lichter 1983) Usually people perceive as distant and for which they have few, if any, alternative sources of knowledge (Lippman 1925; Postman 1985; Edelman 1988). In addition, news is used to amplify feelings (Singer 1973; Tichenor et al 1980; Ericson et al 1989, 1991). However, people are not as dependable on the news media (Lemert 1970; Levy 1978; Adams 1981). In a way this justifies the reason why Cypriots have overestimated cases of murder, sexual as well as criminal damage. In the case of criminal damage the Cypriots have underestimated the extent of victimization. Although there is an increase of 43% in the number of cases reported to the police, only 5% of the answers in the sample indicate an increase of this type of offences. The explanation is based on the fact that the media do not report extensively these types of offences. It is highly unlikely that the newspapers will report car damage or vandalism unless this is followed by systematic occurrence.

Generally speaking, the positive messages conveyed to the public through the media are fewer but certainly not negative. Only once a year are criminal statistics published in the media. Even then, few people are able to understand the significance of the readings. In essence, non-justifiable arguments are made except for those with a political message. On the contrary, part of the media seek occasions to criticize the police and consecutively the government.

I believe the situation gets worse even when the police public relations officer attempts to publicize the

police record in crime detection. Although crime detection is considerably higher than that of England and Wales (Hadjidemetriou 1983), giving weekly bulletins that the police have dissolved criminal gangs, or arrested drug users, or found offensive weapons in houses or made arrests on the course of the investigation for the latest explosion, really do not reassure the public about police performance in crime deterrence. Alderson 1979 evaluates the situation as follows:

"The police, therefore are vulnerable to damage from television unless corrective measures are taken. In taking steps to counteract these effects, the police should be careful not to appear to be too defensive, or they will create further doubts in the minds of the general public. The police, therefore, have to make a positive reaction to such problems, by adjusting the balance to the quality of their own input into television" (Alderson 1979 p. 101).

The above can be true for any form of media besides T.V.

b. Experiencing victimization or fear of crime: Besides moral panic the public overestimates crime values as well as crime patterns when they themselves have been victims of crime or when the threat of victimization is considered real. Overestimation not only occurs when the public reads or listens to news about crime but rather when it experiences crime in their homes or streets. I believe crime density in the country is also a factor in overestimating the level of crime in the country.

Criminal statistics (H.M.S.O 1981) show that there were 5661 cases per 100.000 population reported in England and Wales while the Cyprus Criminal Statistics 1981 show

that there were 483 cases reported per 100.000 population. For this reason I speculate that the fear of crime in England and Wales is more evident than in Cyprus. The high density of cases reported signify this fear.

From the above I speculate that in Britain the perception of crime has misleading bases because it occurs so close to the person (i.e. same person or next door neighbour). This perception strengthens more negative attitudes towards crime. Statistically speaking and neglecting repeated offences and assuming that every one criminal case of crime refers to one person, it shows that residents in England and Wales will fall victims of crime once every 17.7 years while in Cyprus once every 207 years.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to present levels or magnitude of fear of crime because there is no relevant literature on this in Cyprus. However, I can speculate that in Cyprus people estimate criminality on the basis of what they are mostly concerned with reference to what they read or hear in the media. In England and Wales people estimate criminality on the basis of their experience.

The above is verified by the fact that in Cyprus respondents in this current survey have indicated that offences such as homicides, sexual offences, drugs, are on the increase while criminal statistics on the contrary show the opposite picture. These forms of victimization receive great publicity, which make the public believe that crime is all over the place. Garofalo (1981) has defined F.O.C. (Fear of Crime) as an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety which is produced by the threat of physical harm elicited by perceived cues in the environment that relate to some aspect of crime. In conclusion, people are also in fear of crime even if they are not victims (Skogan 1986; Box et al 1988; Parker and Ray 1990).

On the other hand, in England and Wales, the media

have so many news items to cover that they have no time or space to get involved with the single rape, burglary, or act of vandalism. Such items are left for the local newspaper whose circulation is very small. It is evident that nationwide newspapers in England and Wales refrain from publishing news items as suggested above because they are not selling. It is evident that discrepancies are found with the mass media over-representing murder and other forms of serious violent crime and under-representing burglary and other forms of property crime (Antunes and Hurley 1977; Sherizen 1978; Ditton and Duffy 1983). The mass media will publish items if they are followed with emotionality or magnitude i.e. repeated rapist, multitraffic accidents, armed robberies, riots etc.

Various studies in England and Wales have indicated that people's fear about crime is relevant to what they experience or what they consider more as a threat. The term experience also includes the degree of realism of the broadcast (Teeran and Hartnagei 1976; Zillman 1980; Tamborini et al 1984; Gunter and Wober 1988); how specific characters are portrayed (Morgan 1984; Gunter 1985); whether the viewers live in a high-crime neighbourhood and has his or her fear been reinforced by exposure to television violence (Doob and McDonald 1979) and whether the person or someone he or she knows has been a victim of a serious violent crime (Garofalo and Laub 1978; Shottand et al 1979; Skogan and Maxfield 1981; Friedman et al 1982; Perloff 1984). People who have been victimized particularly in their neighbourhood or know others who have been similarly victimized, will tend to be more afraid (Balkin 1979; Hough 1985; Lawton and Yaffe 1980; Linguist and Duke 1982; Ollenberger 1981; Skogan 1987 Stafford and Gulle 1984).

The I.C.S. (1986) indicates that burglaries and acts of vandalism are more prevalent and street robberies and

teenage rowdiness less prevalent as indicated in the B.C.S. (1983) findings. In essence the public will show more concern to what goes on around them or their immediate environment, rather than general perception of crime.

"These findings again demonstrate that the people's beliefs about crime do bear a close relation to the real facts about the areas in which they live" (I.C.S. 1986 p. 2.7).

The above refers not only to specific forms of victimization but also to demographic characteristics of victims. For instance lower class residents will have different concerns from those of higher class residents. In addition, sex differences play a role in crime perception. Females for instance will be more sensitive to offences which are directed against women such as sexual offences. The above paragraph is applicable to both Cyprus and England and Wales. Data in this chapter verify the above.

Therefore, in order to establish some solid frame to the above with reference to the method of policing in either country, it is necessary to say first that crime evaluation by the public is a very crucial aspect. This is a regulating force against the relationship with the police and the authorities.

In Hadjidemetriou (1983) I showed that a newspaper clipping announced in big capital letters an increase of female criminality by 10%. In reality there were only 12 more women appearing in court in furtherance of an offence. This publication initiated panic among the public and all civil organizations attacked the police for not doing much to prevent the situation. Some years later (Hadjidemetriou 1986), the public again attacked the police through the media for not doing enough to prevent two consecutive

murders of women. If the press was in a way following some kind of code of ethics, the Cypriots would not have been the victims of daily bombardment of crime orientated news. As a consequence, their evaluation of crime would have been more rational. Furthermore, they would have felt more secure and their feelings about the police would have been positively reinforced.

The people's evaluation of crime inevitably has an effect on criticism about crime control as well as expectation and more directly against police-public relationships. Data in this chapter show that a large proportion of respondents believe that the police should be stricter with offenders and, in addition, the courts should issue more severe sentences. The above attitudes indicate ways and methods of which their fears and concern about crime will be eliminated. For instance, the respondents believe that their fear and anxiety about crime increase will be eliminated, if the police or the state initiates a strict policing method, or severe treatment of the offenders. The police are blamed for a number of issues merely for public ignorance (Manning 1977).

Following the above suggestions presented in this survey, I would like to make a prediction as to what will become to the issue of crime control if the above measures (policing suggestions) are adopted by the Cypriot police. It is clear that if the police force uses severe methods of policing (i.e. abuses authority, uses force against demonstrators, people on strike as well as offenders), then it is certain it will distant itself from the public, perhaps not out of personal contact but because of the bad publicity such moves will receive. In order to use strict methods of policing, the police will have to change the current policing method and embark on a more repressive form which will be the result of extensive powers. Such powers will probably include a stop and search policy, not

following "Judges' Rules" in questioning, arrest and detention longer than necessary and generally interfering with the foundations of social structure. As it has already been mentioned in earlier chapters, the Cypriot police bases its social control policy on the involvement and assistance it receives from the family and family networks as well as influences. If these links between the family and the police are broken, then it is expected to find some hostility in the relationship. As the police try to enforce the harsh methods of policing, they will inevitably interfere with social control maintained by the family's various agencies and mechanics. By doing so they will undermine the role of these agencies (Headmen, peers). As a result more crime will come to the surface on account of two reasons:

- a) Increase of crime
- b) Decrease of crime tolerance

a) Crime will inevitably increase because there will be no social controls to deter or prevent crime. For this reason more crime will come to the surface which in other situations would not be recorded.

b) As a consequence of the elimination of the structural control in the family, there will be no need by members to tolerate crime for the sake of peace. There will be no head figure to lay down norms and values. One will expect these members to go to the police and report their victimization and ask for security because the police will take the place of the social protector.

Another development of the issue in question relates to the fact that more crime will be reported to the police. Considering the Cypriot reality about high police density, then it is expected that there will be a serious disruption of social life as far as criminal control is concerned.

Provided the police do not totally alienate themselves from the public, I predict that there will be more crime reported to the police and even a decrease of the value of unrecorded crime. Victims will turn to the police because they will have no reasons not to do so. After all, some of their relatives are policemen. On the other hand, if the police becomes hostile and alienate's itself from the public, then it is expected that crime will not be reported and dark figures of crime will stay at high levels.

In addition, the police will initiate a chain reaction of events which will imbalance social control as well as order. Such reactions will include an increase of recorded crime (more known victimization will come to the surface) and social panic because crime will be overestimated; also the police will ask for more powers and personnel to combat new situations, (more money, more criminals); inevitably more prisoners, more expenses, and an effect on the publicity of the government etc.

I personally believe that the above results should also be viewed from a different perspective, mainly referring to the agencies that motivate the respondents of this survey to make the above suggestions. These reasons include:

- a) Moral panic
- b) Victimization or fear of crime.

As it has already been mentioned, the Cypriots receive extented publicity in the media concerning crime issues. For this reason, the awareness of crime in Cyprus is mainly due to the publicity in the media and not the experience of victimization (Note earlier points covering crime perception in Cyprus and England and Wales). As a consequence, the Cypriots mainly respond to the publications. If the tabloids were not spending so much time on crime, then it is certain that the public would not be fearing crime or making harsh suggestions for the

prevention of crime (Garofalo 1981; Skogan 1986; Box et al 1988; Parker and Ray 1990; Dominick 1973; Gerbner and Gross 1976; Graber 1979; Humphries 1981; Sheley and Ashkins 1981; Fedler and Jordan 1982; Lichter and Lichter 1983). In essence the public's response matches the perception of crime it receives in the media. Similarly, if members of certain groups (i.e. youth or indeed victims) share their experience of the police through rumour and hearsay, the more the effects of the experiences may be amplified (Tuck and Southgate 1981). For this reason it is expected that, if crime coverage was increased, then inevitably the public would respond accordingly by suggesting even harsher police measures.

I feel that there is a certain amount of frustration in the whole process of crime perception and suggestions for crime prevention. In the case of Cyprus, I find it necessary to maintain a certain amount of frustration among the public, concerning crime issues because this initiates interest in offences, general deterrence and awareness in social control. A lack of or limited frustration will lead to the elimination of interest in crime issues on the part of the public.

As a final note I wish to state that the findings of this chapter should be used as indicators to the police as to what policing measures are accepted by the public and to what degree. Due to certain computation limitations of this study, it is not possible to correlate responses made by victims and non victims. This would have shown the extent of victims' involvement in the above suggested measures to deter and prevent crime. By doing so, I could have pointed as to what groups of people favour which policing measures and for what forms of victimization.

This information hopefully will assist the police to direct its efforts towards certain forms of victimization with measures mostly accepted to the general public. I

find it necessary in the future to conduct an investigation specifically to measure policing methods accepted by the public and how much these measures would affect family control as well as criminal tolerance, and fear of crime.

However, due to the inability of this study to make a clear generalization, I suggest that the results which have been presented in this chapter should be seen as indicators of public concern towards crime control.

Tables of Chapter Seven

Table 7.2 Assumed crime increase. Absolute numbers.

| | <u>SEX</u> | | <u>EDUCATION</u> | | | <u>DISPLACED</u> | | <u>RESIDENCY</u> | | <u>AGE</u> | | | |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>MALE</u> | <u>FEMALE</u> | <u>ELEMEN.</u> | <u>SECON.</u> | <u>UNIVE.</u> | <u>REFU.</u> | <u>N.REF</u> | <u>URBAN</u> | <u>RURAL</u> | <u>15-29</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>45+</u> |
| BASE | 430 | 224 | 196 | 185 | 206 | 39 | 144 | 286 | 289 | 141 | 144 | 125 | 161 |
| YES | 316 | 163 | 143 | 115 | 168 | 33 | 112 | 204 | 232 | 84 | 119 | 89 | 108 |
| NO | 92 | 55 | 37 | 56 | 32 | 4 | 26 | 66 | 45 | 47 | 21 | 30 | 40 |
| DIK | 22 | 6 | 16 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 13 |

Table 7.3 Assumed crime increase, Percentages.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | RESIDENCY | | AGE | | | |
|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | TOTAL | MALE | FEMALE | ELEMEN. | SECON. | UNIVE. | REFU. | N.REF | URBAN | RURAL | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45+ |
| BASE | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| YES | 73.5 | 72.8 | 73.0 | 62.2 | 81.6 | 84.6 | 77.8 | 71.3 | 80.3 | 59.6 | 82.6 | 71.2 | 67.1 |
| NO | 21.4 | 24.6 | 18.9 | 30.3 | 15.5 | 10.3 | 18.1 | 23.3 | 15.6 | 33.3 | 14.6 | 24.0 | 24.8 |
| DIK | 5.1 | 2.6 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 2.9 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.6 | 4.1 | 7.1 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 8.1 |

Table 7.4 Responses by males concerning the reason why crime has increased in Cyprus.

| BASE RESPONSES | MALES | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL (163) | |
|---|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------------|-------|
| | URBAN | | | | | RURAL | | | | | | |
| | ELEMENT. | | SECOND. | | UNIVERS. | ELEMENT. | | SECOND. | | UNIVERS. | | |
| | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | REF. NR | | |
| 1. Family problems | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | 16 | 9.8 |
| 2. Foreigners | 16 | 19 | 2 | 15 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 88 | 54.0 |
| 3. Civilization | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 4 | 2.5 |
| 4. Economical reason | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 5 | 3.1 |
| 5. T.V. and Video | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 2 | 10 | 6.1 |
| 6. Bad policing | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 7 | 4.3 |
| 7. No enforcement | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 3.1 |
| 8. Unemployment | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | | | | 1 | | 15 | 9.2 |
| 9. Bringing-up | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | | 11 | 6.7 |
| 10. Development | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 13 | 8.0 |
| 11. Freedom to the youth | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 32 | 19.6 |
| 12. Post-war problems | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 1.8 |
| 13. Influence of the breakdown of morality | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | 6 | 3.7 |
| 14. Psychological | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 2.5 |
| 15. Displacement | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | | 8 | 4.9 |
| 16. Other | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 59 | 36.2 |
| TOTAL | 45 | 43 | 9 | 37 | 31 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 26 | 12 | 286 | 100.0 |

* Some respondents gave more than one answer.

Table 7.5 Responses by females concerning the reason why crime has increased in Cyprus.

| BASE RESPONSES | URBAN | | | RURAL | | | TOTAL (143) | % |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------|
| | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | UNIVERS. REF. NR | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | UNIVERS. REF. NR | | |
| 1. Family problems | 1 | 2 | | | | | 3 | 2.1 |
| 2. Foreigners | 9 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 97 | 67.8 |
| 3. Civilization | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 0.7 |
| 4. Economical reason | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 0.7 |
| 5. T.V. and Video | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 18 | 12.6 |
| 6. Bad policing | | 2 | | | | | 7 | 4.9 |
| 7. No enforcement | | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 7 | 4.9 |
| 8. Unemployment | 1 | 2 | | | | | 7 | 4.9 |
| 9. Bringing-up | 2 | | | | | | 9 | 6.3 |
| 10. Development | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 13 | 9.1 |
| 11. Freedom to the youth | 3 | 10 | 1 | | | | 23 | 16.1 |
| 12. Post-war problems | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2.1 |
| 13. Influence of the breakdown of morality | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | 5 | 20 | 14.0 |
| 14. Psychological | | | | | | | 1 | 0.7 |
| 15. Displacement | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 5.6 |
| 16. Other | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 22 | 15.4 |
| TOTAL | 20 | 42 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 11 | 240 | 100.0 |

* Some respondents gave more than one answer.

Table 7.6 Responses made by all respondents regarding the reasons of the increase of crime in Cyprus.
VARIABLES

| RESPONSES | 15-29 | | 30-44 | | 45-60 | | TOTAL | % |
|--|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| | MALES | FEMALES | MALES | FEMALES | MALES | FEMALES | | |
| 1. Family problems | 9 | 3 | 2 | | 5 | | 19 | 3.6 |
| 2. Foreigners | 38 | 33 | 27 | 41 | 23 | 23 | 185 | 35.1 |
| 3. Civilizaton | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 5 | 1.0 |
| 4. Economical reason | 4 | | 1 | | | 1 | 6 | 1.1 |
| 5. T.V. and Video | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 28 | 5.3 |
| 6. Bad policing | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 2.7 |
| 7. No enforcement | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 12 | 2.3 |
| 8. Unemployment | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 4.2 |
| 9. Bringing-up | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 3.8 |
| 10. Development | 6 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 4.9 |
| 11. Freedom to the youth | 6 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 55 | 10.6 |
| 12. Post-war problems | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 6 | 1.1 |
| 13. Influence of the breakdown of morality | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 26 | 4.9 |
| 14. Psychological | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 5 | 1.0 |
| 15. Displacement | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 3.0 |
| 16. Other | 25 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 22 | 6 | 81 | 15.4 |
| TOTAL | 113 | 82 | 80 | 88 | 93 | 70 | 526 | 100.0 |
| Don't know | 11 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 22 | | |
| No response | 8 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 22 | 10 | | |
| TOTAL | 19 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 40 | 32 | 146 | |

*Some respondents gave more than one answer.

Table 7.7 Crimes that have risen according to the public.

| RESPONSES | 15-29 | | 30-44 | | 45-60 | | TOTAL | # |
|---------------------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| | MALES | FEMALES | MALES | FEMALES | MALES | FEMALES | | |
| 1. Thefts | 40 | 48 | 31 | 42 | 57 | 41 | 259 | 39.4 |
| 2. Burglaries | 17 | 20 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 7 | 71 | 10.8 |
| 3. Homicides | 27 | 26 | 10 | 27 | 14 | 18 | 122 | 18.6 |
| 4. Rapes | 17 | 16 | 7 | 23 | 14 | 8 | 85 | 12.9 |
| 5. Traffic offences | 4 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | | 19 | 2.9 |
| 6. Narcotics | 9 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 34 | 5.2 |
| 7. Sexual | 6 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 3.9 |
| 8. Hooliganism | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0.6 |
| 9. Criminal damage | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 0.5 |
| 10. Robberies | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 10 | 1.5 |
| 11. Explosions | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 8 | 1.2 |
| 12. Smuggling | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | 0.5 |
| 13. Other | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 2.0 |
| TOTAL | 129 | 127 | 75 | 117 | 124 | 85 | 657 | 100.0 |
| NO RESPONSES | | | | | | | | |
| Don't know | 7 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 13 | | |
| No response | 8 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 18 | 8 | | |
| TOTAL | 15 | 6 | 16 | 15 | 28 | 21 | | |

Table 7.8 Crimes that have risen according to male respondents.

| RESPONSES | MALES | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----|--|---------------|----|--|----------|----|--|----------|-------|--|
| | ELEMENT. | | | URBAN SECOND. | | | UNIVERS. | | | ELEMENT. | | |
| | REF. | NR | | REF. | NR | | REF. | NR | | REF. | NR | |
| 1. Thefts | 13 | 19 | | 4 | 16 | | 14 | 26 | | 2 | 3 | |
| 2. Burglaries | 12 | 8 | | 1 | 2 | | 8 | 2 | | 7 | 13 | |
| 3. Homicides | 12 | 11 | | 3 | 6 | | 3 | 9 | | 2 | 2 | |
| 4. Rapes | 6 | 10 | | 3 | 2 | | 6 | 5 | | 1 | 2 | |
| 5. Traffic offenses | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| 6. Narcotics | 4 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 3 | | 3 | | |
| 7. Sexual | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | 5 | | 1 | 3 | |
| 8. Hooliganism | | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 9. Criminal damage | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Robberies | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 11. Explosions | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | 2 | | |
| 12. Smuggling | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | |
| 13. Other | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| TOTAL | 54 | 59 | | 19 | 32 | | 35 | 52 | | 5 | 6 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 10 | 18 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 16 | 22 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 328 | 100.0 | |

Table 7.9 Crimes that have risen according to female respondents.

| RESPONSES | FEMALES | | | | | | | TOTAL | % |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----|-------|---|
| | ELEMENT. REF. NR | URBAN SECOND. REF. NR | UNIVERS. REF. NR | ELEMENT. REF. NR | RURAL SECOND. REF. NR | UNIVERS. REF. NR | | | |
| 1. Thefts | 12 20 | 13 26 | 6 21 | 4 11 | 3 4 | 4 7 | 131 | 39.8 | |
| 2. Burglaries | 6 10 | 4 3 | 2 6 | 1 1 | | | 33 | 10.0 | |
| 3. Homicides | 6 9 | 11 13 | 3 11 | 4 7 | 3 | 4 | 71 | 21.6 | |
| 4. Rapes | 3 9 | 11 13 | 8 | 3 | | | 47 | 14.4 | |
| 5. Traffic offenses | 1 1 | 2 | | | 3 1 | | 8 | 2.4 | |
| 6. Narcotics | 2 1 | 1 | 1 2 | 2 1 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.0 | |
| 7. Sexual | 3 | 1 1 | 1 | 1 1 | | 2 | 10 | 3.0 | |
| 8. Hooliganism | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 0.3 | |
| 9. Criminal damage | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 0.6 | |
| 10. Robberies | 1 | | 3 | | | | 6 | 1.8 | |
| 11. Explosions | | | | | | | 1 | 0.3 | |
| 12. Smuggling | 2 | | 3 | | | | 6 | 1.8 | |
| 13. Other | | | | | | | 1 | 0.3 | |
| TOTAL | 33 54 | 40 60 13 | 55 | 13 26 | 9 8 | 7 11 | 329 | 100.0 | |

Table 7.16 Suggestions of male respondents for solving the crime issue.

| VARIABLES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------|----|---------------------|--------------------|----------|----|-------|----|------|-------|
| MALES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RESPONSES | URBAN | | UNIVERS. | | RURAL | | UNIVERS. | | TOTAL | | % | |
| | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | REF. NR | NR | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | REF. NR | NR | NR | | | |
| 1. Strictness | 12 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 44 | 22.1 | |
| 2. Educating youth | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | 17 | 8.5 | |
| 3. Enforcement of Law and order | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | 5 | 2.5 | |
| 4. More police patrols | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 9.1 | |
| 5. Severe sentences | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 37 | 18.6 | |
| 6. Control inflow of foreigners | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | 11 | 5.5 | |
| 7. Educate the public | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 7.0 | |
| 8. Better policing | | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | | 18 | 9.1 | |
| 9. More police interest | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | | 1 | | 3 | 7 | 3.5 | |
| 10. Improve social services | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2.5 | |
| 11. Other | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 23 | 11.6 | |
| TOTAL | 26 | 42 | 5 | 23 | 25 | 28 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 199 | 100.0 |

Table 7.17 Suggestions of female respondents for solving the crime issue.

| RESPONSES | VARIABLES | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------|----|---------------------|--------------------|----------|-------|
| | FEMALES | | | | | | | |
| | URBAN | | UNIVERS. | | RURAL | | UNIVERS. | |
| | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | REF. NR | NR | ELEMENT. REF. NR | SECOND. REF. NR | REF. NR | TOTAL |
| 1. Strictness | 8 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 47 |
| 2. Educating youth | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 21 |
| 3. Enforcement of Law and order | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 8 |
| 4. More police patrols | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 16 |
| 5. Severe sentences | 1 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 1 | | 3 | 43 |
| 6. Control inflow of foreigners | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | | | 14 |
| 7. Educate the public | | 2 | | 5 | 1 | | | 11 |
| 8. Better policing | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | 18 |
| 9. More police interest | | 2 | | | | 1 | | 3 |
| 10. Improve social services | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| 11. Other | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | 21 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 34 | 24 | 47 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 204 |
| | | | | | 18 | | | 100.0 |

Table 7.18 Respondents suggestions for solving the crime issue.

| BASE | VARIABLES 30-44 | | | | TOTAL (281) | % |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------|---------|----------------|-------|
| | 15-29 MALES | 15-29 FEMALES | MALES | FEMALES | | |
| RESPONSES | | | | | | |
| 1. Strictness | 20 | 24 | 9 | 18 | 91 | 32.4 |
| 2. Educating youth | 10 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 38 | 15.5 |
| 3. Enforcement of Law and order | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.6 |
| 4. More police patrols | 6 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 34 | 12.1 |
| 5. Severe sentences | 12 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 80 | 28.5 |
| 6. Control inflow of foreigners | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 25 | 8.9 |
| 7. Educate the public | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 25 | 8.9 |
| 8. Better policing | 8 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 36 | 12.8 |
| 9. More police interest | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 3.6 |
| 10. Improve social services | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2.5 |
| 11. Other | 9 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 44 | 15.7 |
| TOTAL | 78 | 76 | 55 | 75 | 403 | 100.0 |
| Don't know | 13 | 9 | 11 | 13 | | |
| No response | 8 | 7 | 10 | 6 | | |
| TOTAL | 21 | 16 | 21 | 19 | 39 | 149 |

CONCLUSION

The essence of this study is to investigate the effects of the social rupture that occurred in Cyprus almost twenty years ago. Also to study the evolving patterns of crime, policing policy, and generally social control, which are the results of social disorganization.

The social rupture disorganized society to the extent of influencing the mechanics of the existing collective conscience (Durkheim). This has affected the normal progress or development of organization in the society towards organic solitariness. In general, the rupture produced elements which favour deviancy, such as conflicting moral structure (Durkheim), conflict of interest in the opportunities to wealth (Merton) or even the definition of criminality (Becker and Lemert).

The existing means of social control, which are based on the social contract that is constructed by the conformity to moral codes, have been disputed. No more would the social defence mechanisms initiate reactions to suppress antisocial behaviour. The family unit as it is traditionally known, has lost its grip on its members. Evidence to the above is given by Konis and Peristianis.

The above situation resembles similarities of disorganization found in Westernized societies. In these societies there is conflict which inevitably is ineffective in controlling social behaviour through moral codes or through informal application of law and order.

As a consequence to the rupture, the state, as the highest organized authority in Cyprus, had to step in and formally apply law and order through symbolic agencies such as the police. This move has initiated a social chain reaction which challenged the existing methods of law and order. However, it must be pointed out that the challenge was not so severe because already the traditional means of law and order were mutated on account of the social disorganization.

Instead of facing a conflict, state agencies found a positive attitude from the public and the society in general. Results from this study show that overwhelmingly the public shows trust and respect to the police and their functional role. This is no surprise considering the fact that over 70% of the public has a relative or a friend who is a policeman. It is noted that social network plays an important part in the lives of the Cypriots. This is manifested in family life as well as in social groups called "parees" (Peristianis), where groups of friends through informal law of conduct regulate the actions of the group. Family ties also regulate the conduct of members of the groups. Considering that police density in Cyprus is 1:140 as opposed to 1:400 in the United Kingdom (Hadjidemetriou 1983) it is possible that every other family or every other "parea" has a member who is a policeman.

When the public rates positively police behaviour then this brings the police force close to the members of the society. More evidence on the public's mood to help and assist the police is presented by Amer-Oris (1988). The Cypriot sample (as opposed to samples from Austria, France, Italy, Germany, Norway, Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland) is more willing to take risks and get involved in dealing with crime. There is also great likelihood that it will assist and protect a police officer in distress.

Surely, this has an effect on the level of crime as well as the patterns of criminality in Cyprus. Even if the police are not following a specific policing policy, this alone (public involvement in law and order) deters and prevents crime. This means the active participation of the society in crime control.

However, when studying longitudinally the various methods of policing policies in Cyprus, one will observe that: this was not the case, many years ago. Hostility did exist against symbolic authority in the recent past.

Just to mention the Turkish occupation of the previous century and the British rule beginning at the turn of the century and ending almost thirty five years ago. I like would to say that the current method is a product of maturity of the society and maintainance of social norms and values which have preserved the Cypriot culture through troublesome times. These values and norms have offered security to the Cypriots.

Old people have experienced the harsh methods of policing which were initiated as a counter-measure to control the struggle for independence and self-rule. Historically, it is documented that the British used British police officers and Turkish Cypriot policemen to apply these measures. Mistrust and conflict evolved on account that these people were hostile to the Greek Cypriot majority on the island.

Although the true amount of crime is not documented when considering the colonial era Clifford (1954a, 195ab) points that the society presented a powerful social deterrence which regulated criminality. It is logical to assume that the above insinuates that the society was responsible for crime control. Further to the above society was also responsible for the definition of crime as well (Backer). Considering the hostility to the police, the public did not turn to the authorities when victimized or when witnessing a criminal act. This suggests that existing crime was not recorded.

With the formation of the Republic in 1960, the Cypriots received the opportunity to have their own police force made up of members of their own community. Between 1960 and 1974, the police faced criticism because of political instability on the island. For this reason, it did not perform its designated role. This was achieved in the 80s when the police out of necessity upgraded its role and turned professional. Even this turn to professionalism did not affect crucially the social means of deterrence. The coexistence of police formal

means of crime control and informal policing is described by Morris (1957) as symbiosis. Symbiosis consists of various organisms cohabiting in a unified universe. In essence, the police functions alongside informal agencies of crime control and one supplements the other.

Tolerance to crime is one issue or rather the price the members of the society have to pay for the collectiveness when applying informal policing. To some extent, it becomes tyrannical to certain groups in the society (Giddens 1971), because these people cannot seek assistance or justice. Further evidence for the existence of tolerance to crime through informal policing is shown by the fact that in this survey no rape cases were reported. This does not mean that there are no rape occurrences in Cyprus. It merely shows that women are inhibited from reporting sexual offenses. Victims of sexual offenses are stigmatized because their purity is assumed to be doubted hence the tolerance to rapes. Similarly, male victims will not report personal offences to the authorities. Silence is a product of men's hesitation to disclose vulnerability (Mayfield 1984; Granford et al 1990), or man's hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1987). Male victims are considered as weak and helpless if victimization is known (Stanko and Hobdell 1993). In Cyprus this is more evident than in the United Kingdom. Victims have considered their case as a private matter not wishing to publicize the event. The result is to tolerate crime which is one negative feature of collective conscience in the administration of informal social control.

It is rather strange to note that the respondents are more willing to report to the authorities property offences but less willing to report personal offenses. The contradiction could be explained in terms of social characteristics of social roles of the sexes (assumed male domination) and, on the other hand, by the need to report property offences on the knowledge that victims

will be compensated by insurance companies. Because of the high police acquaintance rate as well as high density, it was expected to find more sincerity on the part of the public towards police work. However, it seems from the above that it is up to the discretion of the members of the society as to what form of victimization and in what frequency to report to the authorities.

It is interesting to note that in studies in the United Kingdom, as well as other countries, there is a logical cause as to why victims do not come forward and report victimization. Evidence show that victims do not report victimization because they consider their case trivial or the fact that the police could do nothing about it. However, this is not the case in Cyprus. A large proportion of victims did not report their case to the authorities because of triviality. Only a small fraction indicated that police could do nothing, much lower than the figures presented in the studies of England and Wales (Table 6.3).

What is, therefore, the essence of this condition? This endorses what has already been said about police-public relations and tolerance to crime due to existing social norms. In England and Wales it is documented that the public mistrusts the police to the extent of not reporting their victimization on account that the police could do nothing. On the other hand, in Cyprus the police are trusted but still victims prefer not to go to the police. In Cyprus, victims are more willing to consider cases trivial rather than report to the police. Triviality is, however, an abstract concept. Differences in the perception of triviality are based on cultural identification depending on the sociological make-up that defines that specific culture. In the case of Cyprus, people are more willing to consider a case as trivial as a defence mechanism trying to avoid confrontation with formal law enforcing agents, and at the same time, conform to social norms and values. The above insinuates

that although there is no conflict of the relationship with the police, the society consciously through various social norms and values does not wish symbolic authority to intervene.

However, there is one possibility which this study, I am afraid, has overlooked, but which has become apparent later on. The second part of the questionnaire (section of victimization) enquires as to whether the victims have reported cases of victimization to the police. The above enquiry is asking whether victims have actually gone to the police to inform them of their case of victimization. This insinuates formality which I now consider crucial to investigate the possibility of victims informing police officers who are relatives or friends. Although these police officers are informed of victimization, they do not continue with criminal proceedings or complete official statements of complaint. Another reason for no reporting/recording, is on account that the (relative-friend) police officer decides to neutralize the situation by taking charge of the situation and diffuse it either with personal investigation and cautioning the offender on the spot or using his network of acquaintances in the society to find the criminal and make him compensate the victim. All these, under the cover of symbolic authority, without anything coming to the surface.

What evidence supports the above argument? 1) The police are trusted because they show signs of favouritism (Table 4.8) 2) Acquaintances, friends and relatives, receive different treatment by the police (Table 5.11) 3) The police are more favourable in their treatment to acquaintances, friends, and relatives (Table 5.12).

Therefore, it is possible for the case of Cyprus, victims to report cases to the police but because of the positive relationship which exists among police and the public, these are never recorded because somehow the case is diffused with the involvement of the mediator (i.e.

the friendly / family police officer). Triviality might also evolve when the victim is assured by this specific officer, that the case need go no further. Logically, the victim trusts the police officer, the police officer has fulfilled his social role as a member of society, the social contract has been maintained, the society has no particular reason to get involved and inevitably everybody is happy.

The above is applicable to minor offenses where damage is not so serious. On the other hand, it might be suggested that the society deals differently with cases referring to serious offences. Once the offence is known and made public, then the person, the family and the society in general, cannot offer any cover or apply informality. Feelings of threat and moral panic evolve which overwhelm the society's informal crime control mechanics. This situation asks for compensation, punishment and stigmatization of the offender. The continued publication of sensational news which carries emotional cases of victimisation shapes the attitude of the people to demand revenge.

Having presented the above picture of police behaviour when enforcing informal policing, one might suggest that this is a case of misconduct or corruption, because justice is not universally applied. Some victims or offenders avoid official justice in favour of cultural means of crime control. In essence, the above description pictures society as an organised body which manipulates formal and informal means of social control both functioning side by side with common goals and purpose. Out of this organic interaction there are effects, namely the unfortunate condition of being victimized and not being able to say anything about it.

Although the social rupture occurred in the society more than twenty years ago, under normal circumstances, the culture would have reconstructed the social structures (to some extent). This is possible when

considering the strong moral codes that exist in the country. However, the development of industry, commerce, communications, which were the result of economic strategy to revive the economy of Cyprus, brought also side effects which were damaging to conformity and collective conscience.

One of those side effects produced is the manipulation of the media by individuals or groups, in order to gain political or financial advantages. Mass media is, in my opinion, a thorn on the wound as far as social control is concerned. Although the work of the media is recognized as an important one with reference to general deterrence (in information and system of communication), it seems that this role has been influenced by the financial gains of sensationalism. The effect on society and generally on the perception of crime are tremendous. Out of this sensationalism, the public feels afraid and threatened by crime. Moral panic develops, which affects the structure of collective conscience and social contract. Surely, people from all cultures will feel fear of crime mainly out of experience, or when likely to experience it in the future, but in Cyprus, the fear is initiated by what Cypriots read in the newspapers or watch on T.V.

Although there is a decrease of homicides according to official statistics, the respondents indicated an increase. The fear develops into insecurity and no confidence towards the police. This assumes that the police are not doing their job properly. The sense of fear of crime in Cyprus is real and it is a constant threat to the social contract. Unless the media, and specifically the union of journalists, come up with specific codes of ethics, as far as reporting offenses is concerned, I am afraid the social contract will be under constant stress. This will mean that the public will be more cautious, will not venture out at night and generally be hostile to strangers and new situations. The

above will affect social interactions and will lead to social seclusion, and anomie.

Another interesting result which could be explained in terms of the social solitariness that exists in Cyprus, is the fact that respondents indicated that the major cause of criminality (Table 9.6) are the foreigners. It seems that there is a tendency to project wrong-doing and deviancy to external influences rather than on own society. It is evident that the Cypriots use projection as a means of neutralizing own criminality by blaming others for the deviancy. Projection is a social defence mechanism which balances the forces of fear and threat of crime, and solidarity within the society. Therefore, blaming foreigners for the increase of criminality aims at maintaining solidarity in the society.

Why should foreigners be blamed for the criminality in Cyprus? One reason deals with the publicity foreigners receive in the media when it comes to offenders. As it has already been said, there is a reluctance for Cypriots to report victimization based on the fact that the police in some cases use discretion when it comes to dealing with cases of crime involving Cypriots. Discretion means no reporting, no recording. Inevitably, cases which involve foreigners receive full media coverage. Repetition of news conditions Cypriots to believe that foreigners are the instigators of crime in Cyprus.

Since the general perception is that the foreigners are responsible for the increase of criminality in Cyprus, it is no surprise that the respondents of this study have considered tough measures as the response to crime increase. It is certain that if foreigners were not to be blamed for the increase of criminality, it is clear that the response to the measures in confronting criminality would have been different. It is true to say that Cypriots are involved in more serious offenses than foreigners. Also Cypriot criminals receive more publicity than foreigners but still it takes one case to stigmatize

all of them. Is there a remedy for this attitude expressed by the Cypriots? It is doubtful, because over two million tourists visit Cyprus annually. Foreigners are mainly involved with petty thefts, burglaries, possession of drugs, illegal entry to the country and fraud. When these come to the attention of the media, then they receive full coverage.

Generally speaking, foreigners, whether they are immigrant workers, settlers, or long term residents in one country (even in the United Kingdom), are viewed with hostility and suspicion, because of the difference of their skin colour, religion, or cultural habits. Cyprus is not immune to this perception.

Having presented some crucial findings, it is logical to predict future development in the structure of the social contract in Cyprus and the effect this will have on the amount and patterns of criminality. Therefore, bearing in mind the following facts, one can draw certain conclusions. These are:

The Facts:

A. In Cyprus, social control is mainly achieved through a string of social values and to some extent through symbolic authority. Formal and informal social control function side by side the one supplementing the other.

B. The Cypriot police density is very high, in comparison with other countries. As a result the policemen have a special place and a significant role to play in the society. This produces confidence and security to the public which inevitably assists crime detection as well as deterrence.

C. Due to the fact that the public feels that it is policed by members of its own community it tends to show satisfaction towards police practices. Satisfaction is evident when policing neighbourhoods, villages or when

contacting the police for whatever reason.

D. The public feel that the police should spend more time on traffic control rather than matters of crime. This endorses the fact that the Cypriots consider crimes as a secondary issue.

E. Overwhelmingly, the public has indicated that there is evidence that the police were favourable to acquaintances as well as political figures. This is so on account of the big police density on the land as well as the strength of the kinship that exists between the public and the police. To a certain extent, the public feels that the police are biased towards some people and groups in the society.

F. The most frequent forms of victimization relate to theft of property outside the house as well as theft of parts and items from motor bikes. In general, offences portray the economic and social standards of Cyprus. Certain forms of victimization such as sexual or those that refer to general morality are not reported by respondents. This is on account of the stigma that labels such victims.

G. Respondents did not report property victimization on account that offenses were seen as not serious. On the other hand, respondents did not report offenses against the person because they were seen as a personal issue.

Witnesses do not report offenses to the police on account that they do not wish to get involved. However, the majority of witnesses do report to the authorities victimization of relatives. This is supported by earlier argument that states that kinship in Cyprus is very strong and there is a tendency to support family members.

H. About 12% of the total cases of victimization which

were reported in the survey were reported to the police. Only 33% of those cases of victimization which were considered as criminal were reported to the authorities. The majority of cases reported refer to property offenses.

I. Cypriots prefer to tolerate personal victimization directed against them when offence will in any way become a threat to their position (stigmatization) in the society. A stigmatized person is outcast from the community and cannot enjoy privileges or security provided by the network of kinship or comradeship. Owing to this effect, a certain amount of crime tolerance is acceptable by the Cypriots.

J. Cypriots are influenced in their perception of the amount and patterns of crime mostly by the media rather than experiencing victimization or facing a real threat of victimization. As a consequence, Cypriots turn towards retribution and harsh police measures in solving the assumed crime increase.

K. Cyprus will soon become a member of the E.U. which will indirectly affect the social structure of Cyprus. Inevitably, this will affect the social contract and collective consciousness as far as law and order is concerned. Membership to the E.U. will create another social rupture on account of the intense influence from European cultures.

L. Cypriot society shows an increase of nationalistic temperament, a turn towards nationalism, religiousness and a return to old values. The above are supported by the Archbishop of Cyprus, a controversial but much respected person in the Cypriot society.

Having presented in summary some of the crucial

findings it is easy to predict future developments in Cyprus as far as social control is concerned.

Assuming that the political scene will remain the same, considering also that Cyprus is not joining the E.U. (contrary to expectations) as a full member in the near future, bearing also in mind there will be no major increase in the number of police officers, accepting that internal politics will see no major conflicts, also accepting the drive towards nationalism, conservatism and a return to old values with the church as a regulator of moral conduct, then it is possible to see a strengthening of the social contract and an increase in conformity. As a result, there is going to be a high dark figure of crime, police being kept away from involvement, tolerance to crime and suppression of certain victims whose cases are considered a moral threat.

What happens now if some of the above factors do change unexpectedly? There are numerous computations to consider. In this study I will take into consideration the most important change which will affect law and order in general. What if there is a political settlement and as a result there is a demilitarization of Cyprus? This means that the Cypriot society will have to bear the weight of more than ten thousand eighteen to twenty year old males on the streets of Cyprus. Currently there are no foundations to absorb all these people and offer them occupation or means to offer them a living. As a consequence, there will be a competition for the satisfaction of opportunities (Merton) and inevitably a conflict in moral code (Durkheim). Crime and deviancy will be the logical outcome of such situation.

The only measure which I believe should be taken is to offer opportunities for further and higher education or specialist training, and mainly try to control this population inside educational establishments or through educational working experience funded by the government.

In addition, plans should be made to absorb them in the society in general.

Going back to demilitarization, this move will mean dismantling the reservists' force which currently affects all males over twenty years old. The reservists contribute to the bonding in the Cypriot society by initiating and maintaining associations in the form of friendship "parea" (Peristianis 1966). Army reservists have a special association with each other in and out of the regiment. This special bonding, which is based on trust, security, and self-preservation, generates a number of social norms which form conformity. If this grouping is to vanish then this mass consensus will be terminated. Inevitably there is going to be another rupture in the schema of collective conscience among the male population.

An increase of the police or adopting harsher measures will only create more problems.

If Cyprus joins the E.U., then the residents will feel confident and secure because the Turkish threat will vanish. This will drive Cypriots towards liberalism, egalitarianism, and generally create a distance from traditional moral codes the purpose of which was to keep the residents united against the Turkish threat. Collective conscience will exist no more because there is going to be a loosening of the grip the society has on its members. Anomie will evolve which, in its turn, will affect law and order. As long as the idea of joining the E.U. is at a distance, this keeps society on the defensive in not allowing any changes of loosening up which will affect the social contract, and conformity. Again, if Cyprus enters the E.U., then the police and the Courts will have to follow unified criminal procedures which in a way will take away from their hands discretionary powers.

Currently, there is a constant debate in Cyprus for the increase of police manpower. If this is passed by the

House of Representatives, it means that the police force will increase by five hundred special constables. Logically, this will mean: more police officers on the streets will record more offenses. Inevitably, this will produce a domino effect because the assumed crime increase will need more police officers to cope with it. The argument will never stop.

The church in Cyprus is a powerful institution. Traditionally, the church is the only authority in Cyprus which unifies all the people. Not only it is politically powerful, but it is also economically sound. It has the means, the money, and the time, to convey religiosity on the Cypriots. By doing so, it will revive traditional means of social control based on cultural moral codes. Inevitably, it will influence the traditional means of social control. How far the church will go in transforming society, is not clear. It is unpredictable. The church has bought its own T.V. and radio stations transmitting their own messages and ideas.

Finally, if the union of journalists in Cyprus are to issue a directive to its members not to overdo it with criminal reporting, then I believe the Cypriots will not fear crime so extensively. On the other hand, I must admit that the media are a powerful agent that trasmits general deterrence. If it was to terminate current publicity policies maybe there might be an increase of offences due to the ineffectiveness of general deterrence. This is an issue which requires further research.

Contribution to Current Policing Methods

It is a fact that any policing policy has to take serious consideration of the active involvement of the public on issues relating to social control.

1. The Cypriot study has shown that the police owes most of its success in the battle against crime to the social

interaction between police and the public. Manpower is a crucial factor in deterring crime. Results from Cyprus show that a high police density in the country offers the opportunity for people to relate themselves more with the police, provided that the officers maintain maximum interaction with the public. Posting policemen outside their own communities does not generate interaction with the public. It is possible to generate negative feelings.

If the answer to the crime issue involves high police density, then I suggest to calculate the financial cost it will require to employ more police officers and compare the cost of crime. It is certain that, in the long run, high police density will be beneficial to the community in more than one ways. It is advisable that in the above situation the police should be involved with the community, otherwise the large police force will become dominant and suppressive with damaging effects to the society.

2. The family unit contributes to the interaction between the police and the public. The more unity in the society the less anomie. In Cyprus, unity is achieved through the norms and values that are based on the cultural identity of the Cypriots. This strengthens the associations between the people in the country. Also norms and values define social behaviour and stigmatize wrong doings. The culture itself has defence mechanisms which allow it to prevent as well as to deter criminal behaviour. Therefore, the existence of social norms and values assist in the prevention and deterrence of crime in the country.

3. How democratic is one place when a group of people or community members impose laws other than those found in judiciary courts? How can one formulate a policing policy requesting the involvement of the public to fight crime, take measures to deter and prevent crime, and also be within the limits of democracy, freedom and civil rights?

Is it ethical for society in general to ask victims to tolerate crime for the sake of peace?

Theorists have to accept that human rights must be preserved as much as possible, otherwise it is possible to lead to anarchy if the community or groups of people get too involved with the issue of social control. On the other hand, if the police are dominant, then they become suppressive. The society must come up with a specific procedure as far as law and order are concerned so that the public will feel secure from criminality and at the same time maintain civil rights and human dignity.

Appendices

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, R. (1981). 'Newspapers and Television as News Information Media'. Journalism Quarterly Vol. 58 pp 627-629.
- AGNEW, R. (1984). 'Autonomy and Delinquency': Sociological Perspectives Vol. 27 No.2 pp 219-240.
- ALDERSON, J. (1979). 'Policing Freedom'. Macdonald and Evans.
- ALKER, H.R. (1969). 'A Typology of Ecological Fallacies'. in M. Dogan and S. Rokkan eds. Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press pp 69-86
- ANDERSON, N. (1923). The Hobo. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ANTILLA, I. and JAAKOLA, R. (1966). Unrecorded Criminality in Finland. Helsinki: Kriminologinen Tutkimuslaitos.
- ANTUNES, G. and Hurley, P. (1977). 'The Representation of Criminal Events in Houston's Two Daily Newspaper's' Journalism Quarterly Vol. 54 pp 756-760
- ATTALIDES, M. (1981). Social change and Urbanisation in Cyprus. A study of Nicosia. Publication of the Social Research Centre. Nicosia, Cyprus.
- BAGLEY, C. (1973). The Dutch Plural Society. Oxford: University Press.
- BAINBRIDGE, W.S. (1989). 'The Religious Ecology of Deviance' American Sociological Review Vol. 54 No.2 pp 288-95.
- BAKER, M.H, NIENSTEDT B.C., EVERETT R.S. and McCLERY R. (1983). 'The Impact of Crime Waves: Perception, Fear and Confidence in the Police'. Law and Society Review. Vol. 17 pp 319-335.
- BALDAMUS, W. (1976). The Structure of Sociological Inference London Martin Robertson.
- BALDASSARE, M. (1986). 'The elderly and fear of crime' Sociology and Social Research Vol. 70 pp 218-221.
- BALDWIN, J. and BOTTOMS, A.E. (1976). The Urban Criminal. London: Tavistock.
- BALDWIN, R. and KINSEY R. (1982). Police Powers and Politics London: Quartet Books.

- BALKIN, S. (1979). 'Victimisation rates, safety and fear of crime' Social Problem Vol.26 pp 343-358.
- BAUMER, T.L. (1985). 'Testing a General Model of Fear of Crime Data from a National Sample'. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency Vol. 22 No.3 pp 239-255.
- BAYLEY, D.H. (1969). The Police and Political Development in India. London: Sage.
- BECCARIA, C. (1804). 'Essay on Crimes and Punishments' (original published as Dei delicti e delle pane 1764) reference here to essay on Beccariq in H. Mannheim ed. 1960 (See also Beccaria, of. Crimes and Punishments. Oxford University Press 1964.
- BECKER, H. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance New York: Free Press.
- BECKER, H. (1974). 'Labelling Theory Reconsidered' in P. Rock and M. McIntosh (eds) Deviance and Social Control London: Tavistock p.121-132.
- BEIRNE, P. (1983). Generalization and its Discontents: The Comparative Study of Crime' in Barak - Glantz and Johnson eds. Comparative Criminology. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- BELSON, W.A. (1969). 'The Extent of Stealing by London Boys and Some of its Origins'. London: Survey Research Centre, London School of Economics.
- BELSON, W.A. (1975). Juvenile Theft: The Causal Factors London: Harper & Row.
- BENNETT, T. (1986). 'A Decision-making Approach to Opioid' in Cornish and Clarke. The Reasoning criminal New York: Springer.
- BENNETT, T. (1989). 'Factors Related to Participation in Neighbourhood Watch Schemes' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 29 No.3 pp 207-218.
- BENNETT, T. (1991). 'The Effectiveness of a Police Initiated Fear - Reducing Strategy' British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 31 No. 1 pp 1-14.
- BENNETT, T. and LUMPTON, R. (1992). 'A Survey of the Allocation and Use of Community Constables in England and Wales' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 32 No.2 pp 167-182
- BENNETT, T. and WRIGHT, R. (1984). Burglars on Burglary Gower: Aldershot.
- BENNETT, R.R. (1980). 'Constructing Cross-cultural Theories in Criminology' Criminology Vol. 18

BERKOWITZ, L. (1970). 'The Contagion of Violence: An S-R Mediation Analysis of Some Effects of Observed Aggression' in W. Arnold and M. Page eds. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press

BLAIR, T.L. (1974), The International Urban Crisis Hart-Davis.

BLALOCK, H.M.(1961). Causal Inferences in Non-Experimental Research Chapel Hill NC: University of North Carolina.

BLALOCK, H.M (1969). Theory Construction Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

BLALOCK, H.M. (1971). Causal Models in the Social Sciences. London: Macmillan

BLOCK, R. (1979). 'Community, Environment and Violent Crime' Criminology Vol. 17 pp 46-57

BLOCK, R.L.and BLOCK,C.R.(1984). 'Crime Definition, Crime Measurement and victim surveys' Journal of Social Issues Vol. 40 pp 137-160

BOHM, R.M. (1983). 'Beyond Employment: Toward a Radical Solution to the Crime Problem'. Crime and Social Justice Vol. 21 No. 213

BOOTH, A.(1970). 'The Recall of News Items' Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 34 No.4 pp 606-610

BOTTOMLEY, A.K. (1979). Criminology in Focus. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

BOTTOMS, A.E, MAWBY R. and XANTHOS,P. (1987). 'A Tale of two Estates' in D Downes ed. Crime and the City. Essays in Memory of John Barron Mays. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

BOTTOMS, A.E, MAWBY R. and WALKER M.A.(1987), 'A Localized Crime Survey in Contrasting Areas of a City'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 27 No. 1 pp 125-154

BOX, S. (1981). Deviance, Reality and Society 2nd end. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

BOX, S. (1987). Recession, Crime and Punishment London: Macmillan

BOX, S, HALE, C. and ANDREWS, G. (1986). 'Fear of Crime: Causes, Consequences and Control' University of Kent Applied Statistics Research Unit Report to Home Office.

BOX, S. HALE, C. and ANDREWS, G. (1988). 'Explaining Fear of Crime' British Journal of Criminology Vol.28 No.3 pp 340-356

BOWDEN, T. (1980). Beyond the Limits of the Law Harmondsworth: Penguin.

BRAITHWAITE, J. (1979). Inequality Crime and Public Policy London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BRAITHWAITE, J. (1989). Crime, Shame and Reintegration Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

BRAITHWAITE, J. (1993). 'Shame and Modernity'. The British Journal of Criminology Vol. 33 No.1 pp 1-17.

BRAITHWAITE, J. and BILES, D. (1979). Crime Victimization and Reportability Rates: a comparison of the United States and Australia Canberra ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology.

BRENNAN, T, HUIZINGA, D. and ELLIOTT, D. (1984). The Social Psychology of Runaways Lexington, Mass: Heath

BRENNER, M. H. (1976). 'Effects of the Economy on Criminal Behaviour and the Administration of Criminal Justice in the United States, Canada, England and Wales and Scotland in Economic Crisis and Crime' Rome: UNSDRI

BROGDEN, M. (1987). 'The Emergence of the Police - The Colonial Dimension' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 27 No. 1 pp 4-14

BRYMAN, A. (1988). Quantity and Quality in Social Research London: Unwin Hyman.

CAIN, M.E. (1973). Society and the Policemen's Role Routledge and Kegan Paul.

CAMPBELL, A. (1981). Girl Delinquents Oxford: Blackwell 1981.

CAMPBELL, D.T. (1969). 'Reforms as experiments'. American Psychologist Vol. 24 pp 409-29.

CANADIAN COUNCIL ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (1970). Transient Youth: Report of an Inquiry in the Summer of 1963. Ottawa: Canadian Council of Social Development.

CANADIAN COUNCIL ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (1971). Youth 1971: An Inquiry into the Transient Youth and Opportunities for Youth Programs in the Summer of 1971. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.

CARR-HILL, R, A and STERN, N.H. (1979). Crime, the Police and Criminal statistics New York: Academic Press.

CARRIERE, K. and ERICSON, R. (1989). Crime Stoppers: A study in the Organization of Community Policing Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.

CARROLL, J.S. (1978). 'A Psychological Approach to Deterrence: The Evaluation of Criminal Opportunities'. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Vol. 36 pp 1512-1520.

CARROLL, J. and WEAVER, F. (1986). 'Shoplifters-Perceptions of Crime Opportunities' A Process tracing study in Cornish and Clarke. The Reasoning Criminal New York: Springer.

CHAMBERS, G. and TOMBS, J. (1984). The British Crime Survey Scotland. Edinburgh H.M.S.O.

CICOUREL, A.V. (1976). The Social Organisation of Juvenile Justice 2nd ed. London: Heinemann.

CLARKE, A.H. and LEWIS M. (1982). 'Fear of Crime Among the Elderly' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 22 pp 41-62.

CLARKE, M.J. (1978). 'Citizenship, Community and the Management of Crime' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 27 No.4 pp 384-400.

CLARKE, M. (1990). 'The Control of Insurance Fraud. A Comparative View'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 30 No.1 pp 1-23.

CLARKE, R.V.G. and CORNISH D.B. (1983). Crime Control in Britain New York: State University of New York Press.

CLARKE, R.V.G. and HOUGH M. (1980). The Effectiveness of Policing Farnborough: Gower.

CLARKE, R.V.G. and MAYHEW P. (1980). Designing out Crime London: H.M.S.O.

CLARKE, R.V. and MAYHEW, P. (1989). 'Crime as Opportunity' British Journal of Criminology Vol.29 No.1 pp.35-46.

CLARKE, J.P. and TIFFT L.L. (1966). 'Polygraph and the interview validation of self reported deviant behaviour'. American Sociological Review. Vol. 31 No.1 pp 516-23.

CLIFFORD W. (1954a). Juvenile delinquency in Cyprus: an initial survey. Cyprus Government publication.

CLIFFORD, W. (1954b). 'Delinquency in Cyprus'. British Journal of Delinquency p.146-150.

CLIFFORD W. (1958). Ten years of probation Cyprus Government publication.

CLINARD, M.B. (1978). 'Comparative Crime Victimization Surveys' some problems and results. International Journal of Criminology and Penology Vol. 6 pp 221-231.

- CLOWARD, R. and OHLIN, L. (1961). Delinquency and Opportunity. A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. London: Routhledge a Kegan Paul.
- CLUTTERBUCK, R. (1980). Britain in Agony Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- COHEN, A. (1955). Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Chicago: Free Press.
- COHEN, L.E. and CANTOR D. (1980). 'The Determinants of Larceny. An Empirical and Theoretical Study'. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. Vol.17 pp 140-159.
- COHEN, L.E. and FELSON, M. (1979). 'Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity'. American Sociological Review. Vol. 44 pp 588-608.
- COHEN, S. and TAYLOR, L. (1972). Psychological Survival: The Experience of Long-Term Imprisonment. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- COLEMAN, A. (1985). Utopia on Trial London: Hilary Shipman.
- COMTE, AUGUSTE (1842). The Positive Philosophy (see 1853 ed. translated by H. Martineau, Trubner).
- COMTE, AUGUSTE (1854). Courts de Philophie Positive Paris.
- CONVERSE, J.M. and PRESSER, M. (1986). 'Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire'. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences 07-063 Beverly Hills: Sage
- CORBETT, C. and SIMON F. (1992). 'Decisions to Break or adhere to the Rules of the Road, viewed from the Rational choice perspective'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 32. No.4 pp 537-549.
- CORDNER, G.W. (1986). 'Fear of Crime and the Police: An Evaluation of a fear-Reduction Strategy' Journal of Police Science and Administration Vol.14 No.3 pp 223-233.
- CORNISH, D.B. and CLARKE, R.V. (1986). The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending New York: Springer.
- CORNISH, D.B. and CLARKE, R.V. (1989). 'Crime Specialisation, Crime Displacement and Rational Choice Theory' in H. Wegener, F. Losel and J. Haisch eds. Criminal Behaviour and the Justice System: Psychological Perspective. New York: Springer.
- CORRIGAN, P. (1979). Schooling the Smash Street Kids London: Macmillan.

CRANE, J. (1991). 'The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighbourhood Effects on Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing' American Sociological Review. Vol. 96 pp 1226-1259.

CRAWFORD, A., JONES, T., WOODLOUSE, T. and YOUNG, J. (1990). The Second Islington Crime Survey Centre for Criminology and Police Studies. Middlesex University.

CRETNEY, A., DAVIS, G., CLARKSON, C. AND SHEPHERD, J. (1994). 'Criminalizing Assault. The Failure of the Offence Against Society Model' British Journal of Criminology Vol.34 No.1 1994

CULLEN, F.T., CLARK, G. A. and WOZNIAK, J.F, (1985). 'Explaining the Get Tough Movement' Federal Probation Vol.49 pp 16-24.

CYPRIOT CRIMINAL STATISTICS (1983). Government of Cyprus Publication No. 10. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRIOT CRIMINAL STATISTICS (1984). Government of Cyprus Publication No.11. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRIOT POLICE REPORT (1983). Government of Cyprus Publication. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRIOT POLICY REPORT (1984). Government of Cyprus Publication. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRIOT POLICE REPORT (1985). Government of Cyprus Publication 1985. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRUS POLICE SCHOOL PUBLICATION (1982). May 1982 Lesson 2. Nicosia Cyprus. Police Academy.

CYPRUS CENSUS (1982). Government of Cyprus Publication 1982. Nicosia, Cyprus.

CYPRUS TOURIST ORGANISATION (1985). Annual Report. Nicosia. Cyprus.

DAVIS, F.J. (1952). 'Crime News in Colorado Newspapers' American Journal of Sociology Vol. 57 pp 325-330.

DENZIN, N. (1970). The Research Act Chicago: Aldine.

Van, DIJK, J.J. and STEINMETZ, C. (1983), 'Victimisation Surveys: Beyond Measuring the Volume of Crime' Victimology: an International Journal Vol. 8 pp 291-309.

DILLMAN, D.A., (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.

- DITTON, J. and DUFFY, J. (1983). 'Bias in Newspaper Reporting of Crime News' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 23 No. 2 pp 159-165.
- DOBASH, R.P., and DOBASH, R.E. (1983). 'The Context - Specific Approach' in D. Finkelhor et al. The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research London: Sage
- DOBASH, R.P., DOBASH, ER, BALLINSTYNE, S., SCHUMANN K, KAULITZK, R. and GUTH HANS-WERNER (1990). 'Ignorance and Suspicion. Young People and Criminal Justice in Scotland and Germany' British Journal of Criminology Vol.30 No.3 pp 306-320.
- DOMINICK, J. (1973). 'Crime and Law Enforcement in Prime-Time Television' Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 28 pp 57-74.
- DONMEZER, S. (1984). Criminology Istanbul: Filiz.
- DOOB, A. and MACDONALD, G. (1979). 'Television Viewing and fear of Victimization: Is the Relationship Causal?' Journal of Personality, and Social Rpsychology Vol. 37 pp 170-179.
- DOWNES, D. (1982). 'The origins and consequences of Dutch penal Policy since 1945' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 22 No.4 pp 325-357.
- DUBOW, F. and PODOLEFSKY, A. (1979). Citizen Participation in Collective Response to Crime Evanston Ill: Center for Urban Affairs.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1912). The Elementary Forms of the Religious Lives reference here to 1954 ed. Chicago: Free Press
- DURKHEIM, E. (1952). Suicide: a Study in Sociology London: Routledge a Kegan Paul.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1953). Sociology and Philosophy (translated by D.F Docock) Chicago: Free Press.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1957). Professional Ethics and Civic Morals London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1962). Socialism and Saint-Simon London: Routhlege and Kegan Paul.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1964a). The Division of Labour in Society London: Routhledge a Kegan Paul.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1964b). The Rules of Sociological Method Glencoe: Free Press.

EDELMAN, M. (1988). Constructing the Political Spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

EGLIN, P. (1987). 'The dispute over the meaning and use of official statistics in the explanation of deviance (suicide and crime)' in J. Hughes, J. Anderson and W. Sharrock, Classic Disputes in Sociology. London: Allen and Unwin.

EKPENYONG, S. (1989). 'Social Inequalities, Collusion and Armed Robbery in Nigerian Cities' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 29 No.1 pp 21-34.

ELIAS, N. (1978). The Civilisation Process The History of Manners, trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell.

ELIAS, N. (1982). State, Formation and Civilisation The civilizing Process, trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell.

ELIFSON, K.W., PETERSEN, D.M., and HADAWAY, C.K., (1983). 'Religiosity and Delinquency': Criminology Vol.21 No.4 pp 505-527.

ELLIOTT, D.S., HUIZINGA, D. and AGETON, S.S., (1985). Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use Beverly Hills, Calif. Sage.

ELLISON, C.G., (1991). 'An Eye for an Eye? A note on the Southern Subculture of Violence Thesis'. Social Forces Vol.69 No.4 pp 1223-1239.

ELMHORN, K., (1965). 'A study in self-reported delinquency among school children in Stockholm' in K.O Christiansend (ed.) Scandinavian Studies in Criminology. London: Tavistock Vol. 1 pp 86-116.

EMPEY, L.T., and ERIKSEN, M.L., (1966). 'Hidden delinquency and social status; Social Forces Vol.44 pp.546-554.

EMMIS, P. (1967). Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey. Washington DC: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

ERICSON, R. (1989). Negotiating Control: A Study of News Sources Milton Keynes: Open University Press/Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

ERICSON, R.V. (1991). 'Mass media, Crime Law and Justice. An Institutional Approach'. British Journal of Criminology Vol.31 No.3 pp 235-249.

- ERICSON, R. (1991). Representing Order: Crime, Law and Justice in the News Media. Buckingham: Open University Press/Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- ERIKSON, K. (1973). 'Notes on the Sociology of Deviance' in E. Rubington and M. Weinberg eds. Deviance. The Interactionist Perspective. New York: Macmillan.
- EYSECK, H.J. (1960). The Structure of Human Personality London: Methuen.
- EYSECK, H.J. (1964). Crime and Personality London: Routledge a Kegan Paul.
- FARRINGTON, D.P. (1981a). 'Delinquency from 10 to 25' Paper Given at the Society for Life History Research Meeting on Antecedents of Aggression and Antisocial Behaviour. Monterey. California.
- FARRINGTON, D.P., and DAWDS, E.A. (1985). 'Disentangling criminal behaviour to crime' in Farrington D.P and Gunn J Eds. Reaction to Crime: the Public, the Police, Courts and Prisons. Chichester: John Wiley.
- FARRINGTON, D.P., GALLAGHER, B, MORLEY, L. St. LEDGER R.J and WEST, D.P (1986). 'Unemployment, School Leaving and Crime' British Journal of Criminology Vol.26 No.4 pp 335-56.
- FARRINGTON, D.P. (1992). 'Criminal career Research in the United Kingdom' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 32 No.4 pp 520-536.
- FEDLER, F. and JORDAN, D. (1982). 'How Emphasis on People Affects Coverage of Crime' Journalism Quarterly Vol.59 pp 474-478.
- FERRI, E. (1901). 'The Positive School of Criminology' English ed. published in 1908 by C.H Kerr and Co. Chicago.
- FISHMAN, G. (1970). 'Patterns of Victimization and Notification' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 19 pp 146-157.
- FISHMAN, M. (1978). 'Crime News as Ideology' Social Problems Vol.25 pp 531-43.
- FISHMAN, M. (1980). Manufacturing the News Austin: University of Texas Press.
- FISHMAN, M. (1981). 'Police News: Constructing an Image of Crime' Urban Life Vol.9 pp 371-394.
- FISKE, J. (1987). Television Culture London: Methuen.

FORGAS, J.P (1980). 'Images of Crime: A multidimensional Analysis of Individual Differences in Crime Perception'. International Journal of Psychology Vol. 15 pp 287-299.

FRIEDMAN, K. BISCHOFF H, DAVIS, R., and PERSON, A. (1982). Victim and Helpers. Reactions to Crime. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

GALLUP, G.H. (1947). 'The Quintamensional Plan of Question Design' Public Opinion Quarterly Vol.11 pp385-393.

GALTUNG, J. (1967) Theory and Methods of Social Research London: Allen a Unwin.

GAROFALO, J. (1977), The police and Public Opinion: An Analysis of Victimization and Attitude Data from 13 American Cities. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

GAROFALO, J. (1981). 'The Fear of Crime: Causes and Consequences' Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology: Vol.72 No.2 pp. 839-859.

GAROFALO, J. and LAUB, J. (1978). 'The Fear of Crime: Broadcasting Our Perspective'. Victimology Vol.3 pp 242-253.

GERBNER, G, GROSS, L, SIGNORIELLI, N, MORGAN, M, and JACKSON-BEECK, M, (1979). 'The Demonstation of Power: Violence Profile No. 10'. Journal of Communication Vol. 29 pp 177-196.

GERBNER, G, GROSS, L, JACKSON-BEECK, M, JEFFRIES, - FOX, S, and SIGNORIELLI, N. (1978). 'Cultural Indicators. Violence Profile No.9' Journal of Communication Vol. 28 pp 175-207.

GERBNER, G, GROSS, L, ELEEY, G, JACKSON-BEECK, M, JEFFRIES-FOX, S, and SIGNORIELLI, N, (1977). 'Television Violence Profile No.8: The Highlights' Journal of Communication Vol. 27 pp 171-180.

GERBNER, G, and GROSS, L, (1976). 'Living with Television: The Violence Profile'. Journal of Communication Vol. 26 pp 173-199.

GIBBONS, D. (1971). 'Observations on the Study of Crime Causation' American Journal of Sociology Vol.77 pp 262-278.

GIDDENS, A. (1971b). 'Durkheim's Political Sociology' Sociological Review Vol. 19 No.4 November pp 477-519.

GILLES-SIMS, A. (1984). 'A multivariate analysis of perceived likelihood of victimisation and degree of worry about crime among older people' Victimology Vol. 9 pp 222-233.

GOLD, M. (1970). Delinquent Behaviour in an American City, California Wadsworth Publishing Co.

GOLDMEIER, J. and DEAN, R. (1972). 'The Runaway: Person, Problem or Situation'. Paper in the United State Senate: Hearings on Runaway Youth before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, 92nd Congress, 1st Session pp. 233-238. Washington DC: House of Representatives.

GOLDSTEIN, H. (1990). Problem-Oriented Policing London: McGraw-Hill.

GORDON, M.T, RIGER, S, LE BAILEY, R.K. and HEATH, L. (1980). 'Crime Women and the Quality of Urban Life' Signs Vol.5 pp144-160.

GOTTFREDSON, M.R. (1981). 'On the Etiology of Criminal Victimization' Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Vol.12 pp714-726.

GOTTFREDSON, M.R and HIRSCHI, T. (1990). A General Theory of Crime Stanford, Ca: Stawford University Press.

GOTTFREDSON, S.D., WARNER, B.D. and TAYLOR R.B (1988). 'Conflict and Consensus in Justice System Decisions' in N. Walker and M. Hough eds. Public Attitudes Towards Sentencing. Aldershot: Gower.

GOULDNER, A.W. (1971). The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology London: Heinemann Educational: New York: Basic Books.

GOWERS, E. (1962). The Complete Plain Words 2nd edn Penguin, Ringwood.

GRABER, D. (1979). 'Is Crime News Coverage Excessive' Journal of Communicatoin Vol. 29 pp 81-92.

GRABER, D. (1980). Crime News and the Public New York: Praeger.

GRABER, D. (1984). Processing the News New York: Longman

GAYFORD, J.J. (1975). 'Wife-Battering: A Preliminary Survey of 100 Cases' British Medical Journal Vol. 284 pp.194-197.

GUNTER, B. (1988). Violence on Television: What the Viewers Think. London: John Libbey.

GUNTER, B. and WOBER, M. (1983). 'Television Viewing and Public Trust' British Journal of Social Psychology Vol. 22 pp 174-176.

GUNTER, B. (1985). Dimensions of Television Violence Aldershot: Gower.

HADJIDEMETIOU, M. (1985). 'Crime in Refugee Housing Estates' Endoskopisis Nicosia 1985.

HADJIDEMETRIOU, M. (1985). 'Female Victimization with Reference to Murder' Seminar for the Socialist Women's Movement. Nicosia.

HADJIDEMETRIOU, M. (1986). 'Sexual offences and Tourism in Cyprus' Seminar for SKAL Club Hilton Nicosia.

HADJIDEMETRIOU, M. (1983). Crime and Justice in Cyprus and England and Wales: A Study of comparison. Thesis University of Wales.

HAGAN, J. GILLS, A.R SIMPSON, J. (1985). 'The Class Structure of Gender and Delinquency: Toward A Power-Control Theory of Common'. Delinquent Behaviour. American Journal of Sociology Vol. 40 No.6 pp 1151-1178.

HAGAN, J. SIMPSON, J.H. and GILLIS, A.R, (1979). 'The Sexual Stratification of Social Control. A Gender-Based Perspective'. British Journal of Sociology Vol. 30 pp 25-38.

HAGAN, J. SIMPSON, J and GILLIS, A.R.(1987). 'Class in the Household. Deprivation Liberation and a Power-control Theory of Gender and Delinquency'. American Journal of Sociology Vol. 92 No4 pp 788-816.

HALL, J.F.(1966). The Psychology of Learning Philadelphia: Lippincott.

HALL, S. CRITCHER, C, JEFFERSON, T, CLARKE, J, and ROBERTS, B, (1978). Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order. London: Macmillan.

HAMMETT, C. (1979). 'Area-based Explanations: A Critical Appraisal' in ed. Herbert D.T and Smith D.M. Social Problems and the City pp 244-260, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HANSEL, M. (1987). 'Citizen Crime Stereotypes: Normative Consensus Revisited'. Criminology Vol. 25 pp 455-485.

HARTNAGEL, T.F. (1979). 'The Perception and Fear of Crime Implication for Neighbourhood Cohesion, Social Activity and Community Effect'. Social Forces Vol. 58 pp 176-193.

- HEAL, K. and MORRIS, P. (1985). 'The Effectiveness of Patrol' in K. Heal, R. Tarling and J Burrows eds. Policing Today London: H.M.S.O.
- HEATH, L. (1984). 'Impact of Newspaper Crime Reports on Fear of Crime' Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Vol. 47 pp 236-276.
- HEISE, D.R. (1969). 'Problems in Path Analysis and Causal Inference' in E.F Borgatta and G.N Bohrnstedt eds Sociological Methodology, San Francisco. Jossey Bass.
- HEISE, D.R. (1975). Causal Analysis New York: Wiley
- HESELTINE, M. (1991). Speech by Michael Heseltine MP, Secretary of State for the Environment to Newscastle Businessmen. 23 March
- HINDELAND, M.J, GOTTFREDSON, M, and GAROFALO, J. (1978). Victims of Personal Crime Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1969), Causes of Delinquency Berkeley: California: University of California Press.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1986). 'On the Compatibility of Rational Choice and Social Control Theories of Crime' in Cornish and Clarke. The Reasoning Criminal. New York, Springer
- HOINVILLE, G, JOWELL, R, and ASSOCIATES (1977). Survey Research Practice London: Heinemann.
- HOLLANDER, P. (1969). 'A Converging Social Problem: Juvenile Delinquency in the Soviet Union and the United States'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 9 No.2 April pp 148-166.
- HOLLINGER, R.C. (1991). 'Neutralizing in the Workplace: An Empirical Analysis of Property, Theft and Production Deviance'. Deviant Behaviour Vol. 12 pp 169-202.
- HOPE, T. (1986a). 'Crime, Community and Environment' Journal of Environmental Psychology Vol. 6 pp 65-78.
- HOPE, T. and HOUGH, M, (1988). 'Area, Crime and Incivilities' A Profile from the British Crime Survey in T. Hope and M. Shaw, eds. Communities and Crime Reduction. London: H.M.S.O.
- HOPE, T. and SHAW M, (1988). 'Community Approaches to Reducing Crime' In T. Hope and M. Shaw eds. Communities and Crime Reduction. London: H.M.S.O.
- HOPE, T. and FOSTER, J, (1992). 'Conflicting Forces: Changing the Dynamic of Crime and Community on a 'Problem' Estate'. British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 32 No.4 pp 488-504.

- HOUGH, M. (1983). 'Victims of Violent Crime' Paper presented at the 33rd International Course in Criminology. Vancouver, BC March 1983.
- HOUGH, M. (1985). 'The Impact of Victimisation: Finding from the BCS'. Victimology Vol. 20/1-4 pp 488-497.
- HOUGH, M. and MAYHEW, P. (1983). The British Crime Survey First Report No. 76 London H.M.S.O. 1983.
- HOUGH, M. and MAYHEW, P. (1985). Taking Account of Crime: Key Findings from the Second B.C.S. London H.M.S.O 1985 No.85
- HOWE, E.S. (1988). 'Dimensional Structure of Judgements of Crimes' Journal of Applied Social Psychology Vol.18 pp 1371-1393.
- HUMPHRIES, D. (1981). 'Serious Crime, New Coverage and Ideology: A Content Analysis of Crime Coverage in a Metropolitan Paper'. Crime and Delinquency Vol. 27 No.2 pp 191-205.
- HUNTER, A. and BAUMER, T.L. (1982). 'Street Traffic, Social Integration, and Fear of Crime' Sociological Inquiry Vol.52 pp 122-131.
- HUSTON, T.L., GEIS, G, WRIGHT, R. and GARRETT, T, 1976. 'Good Samaritans as Crime Victims' Victimology Vol. I pp 284-294.
- ICLI, T.G. (1994). 'Blood Feud in Turkey: A Social Analysis'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 34 No.1 pp 69-74.
- JAYCOX, V. (1978). 'The elderly's fear of crime: rational or irrational'. Victimology Vol.3 pp 329-334.
- JEFFRIES, C. (1952). The Colonial Police London: Max Parrish.
- JEFFORDS, C. (1983). 'The Situational Relationships Between Age and Fear of Crime' International Journal of Ageing and Development Vol. 17 pp 103-111.
- JOHNSON, R.E. (1979). Delinquency and its Origins Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1979.
- JOHNSON, T. (1982). 'The State and the Professions in A. Giddens and G. Mackenzie (eds) Social Class and the Division of Labour. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P pp 186-209.
- JONES, J.M. (1979). Organisational Aspects of Police Behaviour Aldershot: Gower 1979.

JONES, P.N (1980). 'Ethnic Segregation Urban Planning and the Question of Choice' The Birmingham case paper presented to the Conference on Ethnic Segregation in Cities. St. Anton's College, Oxford.

JONES, T. MACLEAN, B. and YOUNG, J. (1986). The Islington Crime Survey: Crime Victimisation and Policing in Inner City London. Aldershot: Gower. 1986.

JUNGER, M. and POLDER, W. (1993). 'Religiosity, Religious Climate and Delinquency Among Ethnic Groups in the Netherlands', British Journal of Criminology Vol. 33 No. 3 pp 416-435.

KARN, V.A. (1979). 'Low Income Owner-Occupation in the Inner City' In (ed.) Jones C. Urban Deprivation and the Inner City pp 160-190. London: Croom Helm.

KEANE, C. GILLIS, A.R, and HAGAN, J, (1989). 'Deterrence and Amplification of Juvenile Delinquency by Police Contact: The Importance of Gender and Risk-Orientation'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 29 No.4 pp 336-352.

KELLING, G.L, PATE, T, DIECKMAN, D. and BROWN, C.E, (1974). 'The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment' A Technical Report. Washington D.C: Police Foundation.

KINSEY, R, LEA, J, and YOUNG, T, (1986). Losing the Fight Against Crime: Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

KIRBY, A. (1981). 'Geographic Contributions to the Inner City: Deprivation Debate: a Critical Assessment'. Area Vol. 13 pp 177-181.

KISH, L. (1949). 'A Procedure for Objective Respondent: Selection Within a Household'. Journal of the American Statistical Association Vol. 44 pp 380-387.

KISH, L. (1965). Survey Sampling New York: Wiley.

KITSUSE, J. and CICOUREL A.V, (1963). 'A Note on the Use of Official Statistics' Social Problems Vol. II No.2 Fall pp 131-139.

KNIGHT, B. and HAYES, R. (1981). Self Help in the Inner City London: London Voluntary Service Committee.

KONIS, T. (1984). 'Social Restriction': Points of Social Concern in the post War Period 1974-1984. Cypriot Youth Centres. Nicosia, Cyprus.

KONIS, T. (1990). True Face of Cypriot Youth Cypriot National Committee for the Year of the Youth 1990. Nicosia, Cyprus.

KORNHAUSER, R.R. (1978). Social Sources of Delinquency Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KRAHN, H. and KENNEDY, L.W. (1985). 'Producing personal safety' Criminology Vol. 23 pp 697-710.

LANDSHEER, J.A, HART, H'T. and KOX, W. (1994). 'Delinquent Values and Victim Damage Exploring the Limits of Neutralisation Theory': British Journal of Criminology Vol. 34 No. 1 pp 44-53.

LAMBERT, J.R. (1970). Crime, Police and Race Relations London: Oxford University Press for Institute of Race Relations.

LANGWORTHY, R.M. and WHITEHEAD, J.T (1986). 'Liberalism and Fear as Explanations of Punitiveness' Criminology Vol. 24 pp 575-591.

LAWTON, M.P. and YAFFE, S. (1980). 'Victimisation and Fear of Crime in Elderly Public Housing Tenants' Gerontology Vol. 35 pp 768-779.

LEA, J. and YOUNG J, (1984), Law and Order Harmondsworth: Penguin.

LEA, J. and YOUNG J. (1984). What is to be Done about Law and Order: Crisis in the Eighties. Harmondsworth Middx: Penguin.

LEE, R. (1976). 'Public Finance and Urban Economy: Some Comments on Spatial Reformism'. Antipodes Vol. 8 pp 43-50.

LEMERT, E. (1967). Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall 1967.

LEMERT, J. (1970). 'News Media Competition under Conditions Favorable to Newspapers'. Journalism Quarterly Vol. 47 pp 272-280.

LESTER, D. (1991). 'Crime As Opportunity' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 31 No.2 pp 186-188.

LEVINE, K. (1978). 'Empiricism in Victimological Research: A Critique'. Victimology Vol. 3 pp 77-90.

LEVY, M. (1978). 'The Audience Experience with Television News' Journalism Monographs 55 April.

LEWIS, D.A. and MAXFIELD, M.G. (1980). 'Fear in the neighbourhoods: An investigation of the impact of crime'. Journal of Research and Delinquency Vol. 17 pp 160-189.

LICHTER, S. and LICHTER, R. (1983). Prime Time Crime Washington DC: The Media Institute.

LIGHTENSTEIN, S, SLOVIC, P, FISCHOFF, B, LAYMAN, M, and COMBS, B, (1978). 'Judged Frequency of Lethal Events' Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory Vol. 4 No. 6 pp 551-578.

LINDEN, R, and FILLMORE, C, (1981). 'A Comparative Study of Delinquency Involvement' The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology Vol. 18 No.3 pp 343-361.

LINDESMITH, A. (1968). Addiction and Opiates Chicago: Aldine 1968.

LIPPMANN, W. (1925). The Phantom Public New York: Harcourt Brace Jorandorich.

LOMBROSO, C. (1911). Crime: Its Causes and Remedies, first published in 1876 as L'Uomo Delinquente. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1911.

LOIZOS, P. (1972). 'Aspects of Pluralism in Cyprus' New Community 1 pp 298-304.

LOIZOS, P. (1975). The Greek Gift: Politics in a Changing Cypriot Village London: Blackwell.

LOIZOS, P. (1970). 'Aspects of Property Transfer Among Rural Greek Cypriot families' Mediterranean Social Anthropological and Sociological Conference Nicosia, 7-12 Sept.

McCABES and SUTCLIFFE, F, (1978). Defining Crime: A Study of Police Decisions. Oxford. Blackwell 1978.

McCARTHY, B. (1990). Life on the street: Serious Theft, Drug-Selling and Prostitution among Homeless Youth. University of Toronto.

McCARTHY, B. and HAGAN, J. (1991). 'Homelessness: A criminogenic situation'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 31. No 4 pp 393-410.

McCLINTOCK, F.H. and WILSTROM, Per-Olof H. (1990). 'Violent Crime in Scotland and Sweden: Rate, Structure and Trends'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 30 No.3 pp 207-228.

McDONALD, L, (1969). Social Class and Delinquency London: Faber.

MACLEAND, B. (1986). Preliminary Report of the Islington Crime Survey Centre for Criminology and Police Studies. Middlesex University.

MAINWARING-WRIGHT, S, (1983). The Policing Revolution Brighton: Harvester Press.

- MARCH, C. (1982) The Survey Method: The Contribution of Surveys to Sociological Explanation. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- MARCH, H. (1988) Crime and the Press: Does Newspaper Crime Coverage Support Myths About Crime and Law Enforcement?. Ph.D. dissertation, Sam Houston State University.
- MARCH, H.L (1991) 'A Comparative Analysis of Crime Coverage in Newspapers in the United States and Other Countries from 1960 to 1989: A Review of the Literature'. Journal of Criminal Justice Vol. 19 pp 67-80.
- MARKIDES, K.C, (1978) Lysi, Social Change in a Cypriot Village Publications of the Social Research Centre. Nicosia, Cyprus.
- MARKIDES K (1974) 'Social Change and the Rise and Decline of Social Movements: The Case of Cyprus' American Ethnologist vol. 1(2) pp 309-330.
- MARSH P, ROSSER E and HARRE (1978) The Rules of Disorder London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- MATSUEDA R.L and HEIMER K. (1987) 'Race Family structure and Delinquency: A Test of Differential Association and Social Control Theories'. American Sociological Review Vol. 52 Dec pp 826-840.
- MAXFIELD, M (1984) Fear of Crime in England and Wales London H.M.S.O study No. 78.
- MAXFIELD, M (1987) Explaining Fear of Crime: Evidence from the 1984 British Crime Survey. Home office Research and Planning Unit No. 43 London: H.M.S.O.
- MAYHEW P, ELLIOT D, and DOWNS L. (1989) The 1988 British Crime Survey Home Office Research Study No. 11 London H.M.S.O.
- MAYHEW P and SMITH L.J.F. (1984) 'Crime in England and Wales and Scotland: A British Crime Survey Comparison'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 25 No. 6 pp 148-159.
- MERTON K.R. (1938) 'Social Structure and Anomy' American Sociological Review. October 1938 No. 3 pp 672-682.
- MERTON R.K (1956) 'The Social Cultural Environment and Anomie' (in) H. Witmer and R. Kotnisky (eds). New Perspectives for Research on Juvenile Delinquency. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office pp 72-109 1956.

MERTON, R.K. (1964). 'Anomie, anomia and social interaction' in M. Clinard ed. Anomie and Deviant Behaviour. New York: Free Press.

MERTON, R.K. (1968). Social Theory and Social Structure 2nd edn New York: Free Press.

MEYER, J.C. (1975). 'Newspaper Reporting of Crime and Justice: Analysis of an Assumed Difference' Journalism Quarterly Vol. 52 pp 731-734.

MIETHER, T. and LEE, G.R. (1984). 'Fear of Crime Among Older People' Sociological Quarterly Vol. 25 pp 397-415.

MINEHAN, T. (1934). Boy and Girl Tramps of America New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

MITCHELL, J., DODDER, R.A. and NORRIS, T.D. (1990). 'Neutralization and Delinquency: A Comparison by Sex and Ethnicity'. Adolescence Vol. 25 No. 98 pp 487-497.

MOORE, M.H. and TROJANOWICZ, R.C. (1988). 'Policing and the Fear of Crime' in Perspectives in Policing Vol. 3 Washington U.S Department of Justice.

MOSER, C. and KALTON, G. (1971). Survey Methods in Social Investigation 2nd edn. London: Heinemann.

MORGAN, P. (1978) Delinquent Fantasies London: Temple Smith.

MORGAN, M. (1984). 'Symbolic Victimization and Real World Fear' in G. Melischek, K Rosengren and J. Stoppers eds. Cultural Indicators: An International Symposium. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Science.

MORGAN, R. (1986). 'Policing By Consent' Legitimizing the Doctrine in D.J. Smith and R. Morgan eds. Coming to terms with Policing. London: Routledge.

MORRIS, T.P. (1957). The Criminal Area: A Study in Social Ecology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MOUZELIS, N. and ATTALIDES, M. (1971). 'Greece' in M. Scotford-Acher and S. Giner. Contemporary Europe: Class, Status and Power. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

MURRAY, C. (1990). The Emerging British Underclass London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

NEWMAN, O. (1973). Defensible Space London: Architectural Press.

NIRUN, N. (1975). Blood Feud Ankara: Sevinc.

- NORRIS, G. (1979), 'Defining Urban Deprivation' In (ed) Jones C. Urban Deprivation and the Inner City pp 17-31. London: Groom Helm.
- O'Keefe, G. 1984. 'Public Views on Crime: Television Exposure and Media Credibility' in R. Bostrom ed. Communication Yearbook vol.8 Beverly Hills: Sage.
- ORIS-AMER, (1988). 'Evaluation of the Cypriot Antisocial Behaviour' Epikeri Nicosia 1988.
- PAINTER, K. (1989). Hammersmith and Fulham Crime and Policing Survey Final Report Middlesex University 1989.
- PALENSKI, J. (1984). Kids Who Run Away Saratoga: R.E. Publishers.
- PAPADOPOULLOS, T. (1965). Social and Historical Data on Population (1970-1881) Nicosia - Cyprus Research Centre.
- PARIS, C, and BLACKABY, B, (1979). Not Much Improvement: Urban Renewal: Policy in Birmingham. London: Heinemann.
- PARKE R, BERKOWITZ, L, LEYENS, J. P, WEST, S. and SEBASTIAN, R, (1977) 'Some Effects of Violent and Non-Violent Movies on the Behaviour of Juvenile Delinquents' in L. Berkowitz ed. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press.
- PARKER, H. (1974). View from the Boys Newton Abbot: David and Charles.
- PARKER, T. (1963). The Unknown Citizen London: Hutchinson.
- PARKET, T. (1965). Five Women London: Hutchinson.
- PARKET, T. (1967). A Man of Good Abilities London: Hutchinson.
- PARKET, T. (1969). The Twisting Lane London: Hutchinson.
- PARTON, D.A, HASEL, M. and STRATON, J. (1991). 'Measuring Crime Seriousness: Lessons from the National Survey of Crime Severity'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 3 No. 1 pp 72-85.
- PARTON, D.A and STRATTON, J.R. (1985). Methods for Understanding Crime Seriousness Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.
- PATE, A.M, WYCOFF, M.A, SKOGAN, W.G. and SHERMAN, L.W. (1986), Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark Washington DC: Police Foundation.
- PATRICK, J. (1973). A Glasgow Gang Observed London: Eyre Methuen.

PEARCE, F. (1976). Crimes of the Powerful London: Pluto Press.

PEARSON, G. (1978). Hooligan. London. MacMillan.

PEARSON, G. (1990). 'Crime and Criminology in Israel: A Personal Account of a British Study Tour'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 30 No. 2 pp 235-243.

PERISTIANIS, J.G. (1966). Honour and Shame: The values of Mediterranean Society. Great Britain.

PERISTIANIS, J.G. (1968). 'Introduction to a Cyprus Highland village' in J.G Peristiany, ed. Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology. Paris. Mouton and Co.

PLUMMER, K. (1983). Documents of Life London: Allen a Unwin 1983.

POLVI, N, LOOMAN, T, HUMPHRIES, C. and PEASE, K. (1991). 'The Time Course of Repeat Burglary Victimization' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 31 No.4 pp 411-414.

POPE, C.E, (1979). 'Victimisation Rates and Neighbourhood: Characteristics: Some Preliminary Findings'. In (ed) Parsonage, W.H, Perspectives on Victimology. Beverly Hills and London: Sage.

POSTMAN, N. (1985). Amusing Ourselves to Death: Discourse in the Age of Show Business New York: Viking.

POWER, A. (1989). 'Housing Community and Crime' in D. Downes eds. Crime and the City: Essays in Memory of John Barron Mays. Basingstoke: MacMillan.

PUNCH, M. (1979). Policing the Inner City London: Macmillan 1979.

PUNCH, M. (1985). Conduct Unbecoming London: Tavistock 1985.

PERLOFF, L. (1984). 'The Effect of Indirect Experience on Perceived Vulnerability to Victimization' Paper presented to the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, May 1984.

PHILLIPS, S.V. and COCHRANE, (1988). The Role and Function of Police Community Liaison Officers Home office Research and Planing Unit Paper no. 51 London H.M.S.O.

RADZINOWICZ, L. (1966). Ideology and Crime: A Study of Crime in its Social and Historical Context. London: Heinemann Educational.

RAHAR, G. (1980). The Measurement of Crime and Delinquency Advances and Problems paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Israeli Society of Criminology.

RAHAR, G, and TERCHMAN, M, (1984). 'Assessing the Seriousness of Deviant Behaviour: The Effects of Interpersonal Resources' in D.J Muller D.E Blackman and A.J Chapman eds. Psychology and Law p. 161-170. New York: Wiley.

REINER, R. (1985). The Politics of the Police Brighton: Harvester.

REX, J. (1981). 'Urban Segregation and Inner City Police in Great Britain' In (ed) Peach C, Robinson V and Smith S. Ethnic Segregation in Cities, pp 25-42 London: Groom Helm.

RIGER, S. (1978). 'Women's fear of crime' Victimology Vol. 3, No. 3-4 pp 254-264.

RIGER, S. et al (1982). 'Coping with crime: Women's use of precautionary behaviours'. American Journal of Community Psychology Vol. 10 pp 369-386.

ROBERT, P. (1978), 'The Extent of Public Information and the Nature of Public Attitudes, towards the Social Control of Crime' Paper presented at the Council of Europe, Thirteenth Criminological Conference, Strasbourg, September.

ROCK, P. (1988). Crime Reduction Initiatives on Problem Estates in Communities and Crime Reduction. London: H.M.S.O.

ROBERTSON, N. and TAYLOR, L, (1973). Deviance, Crime and Socio-legal Control London: Martin Robertson.

ROBINSON, J. and LEVY, M, (1986). The Main Source: Learning From Television News. Beverly Hills: Sage.

ROSENBAUM, D.P, (1988). 'Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature'. Justice Quarterly Vol.5 pp 323-395.

ROSHIER, R. (1973). 'The selection of Crime News by the Press' in S. Cohen and J. Young eds. The Manufacture of News. Beverly Hills: Sage.

ROSSI, P.H, SIMPSON, J.E. and MILLER J.A.L. (1985). 'Beyond Crime Seriousness: Fitting the punishment to the Crime'. Journal of Quantitative Criminology Vol. 1 pp 59-90.

RUSINKO, W.T, JOHNSON, K.W and HORNUNG, C.A. (1978). 'The Importance of Police Contact in the Formulation of Youths: Attitudes towards the Police'. Journal of Criminal Justice Vol. 6 pp 53-67.

SAMPSON, A, STUBBS, P, SMITH, D, PEARSON, G, and BLAGG, H. (1988). 'Crime Localities and the Multi-Agency Approach' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 28 No. 4 pp 478-493.

SAMPSON, R.J. and WOOLDREDGE, J.D. (1986). 'Evidence that High Crime Rates Encourage Migration away from Central Cities' Sociology and Social Research Vol. 70 pp 310-314.

SCAGLION, R. and CONDON, R.G. (1980). 'Determinants of Attitudes towards City Police' Criminology Vol. 17 No.4 pp 485-494.

SCARMAN, LORD (1986). The Scarman Report: The Brixton Disorders 10-12 April 1981. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

SCHATTEBURG, G. (1981). 'Social Control Functions of Mass Media Depictions of Crime' Sociological Inquiry Vol. 51 pp 71-77.

SCHNEIDER, B. (1982). 'The Nonmetric Analysis of Difference Judgments in Social Psychology: Scale Validity and Dimensionality' in B. Wegener ed. Social Attitudes and Psychological Measurement. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

SCHUMANN, K.F. and KAULITZI, R. (1988). 'Limits of General Deterrence: The Case of Juvenile Delinquency' in H.J Kerner and K. Sessar eds. Criminological Research in Germany. New York.

SCHWARTZ, H, and JACOBS, J. (1979). Qualitative Society New York: Free Press.

SEBBA, L, (1980). 'Is 'Mens Rea' a component of Perceived Offense Seriousness?' Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Vol. 71 pp 124-135.

SEGRARE, J.O. and HASTAD, D.N. (1985), 'Evaluating Three Models of Delinquency Causation for Males and Females: Strain Theory, Subculture Theory and Control Theory'. Sociology Focus Vol. 18 No.1 pp 1-17.

SELLIN, T, (1938). 'Culture Conflict and Crime' Social Science Research Council 1938 p 63-70. New York.

SHAW, C.R, (1930). The Jack Roller Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1930.

SHAW, C.R and MCKAY, H.D. (1929). Delinquency Areas Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SHAW,M.and WILLIAMSON,W. (1972). 'Public Attitudes to the Police' Criminologist Vol. 7 No. 26 pp 18-33.

SHELEFF, L.(1974). 'The Criminal Triad - Bystander, Victim and Criminal' International Journal of Criminology and Penology Vol.2 pp 159-174.

SHELEFF, L.S. and SCHICOR, D. (1980). 'Victimological Aspects of Bystander Involvement' Crime and Delinquency Vol.26 pp 193-201.

SHELEY,J, and ASHKINS,C, (1981). 'Crime, Crime News and Crime Views' Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 45 pp 492-506.

SHEPHERD, J.(1990). 'Violent Crime in Bristol: An Accident and Emergency Department Perspective British' Journal of Criminology Vol. 30 No.2 pp 289-305.

SHEPHERD,J.P, SHAPLAND,M.and SCULLY,C. (1989). 'Recording of Violent Offences by the Police: An Accident and Emergency Department Derspective'. Medicine, Science and the Law Vol. 29 pp 251-56.

SHERIZEN, S. (1978). 'Social Creation of Crime News: All the News Fitted to Print'. in C Winick ed. Deviance and Mass Media. Beverly Hills: sage.

SHEPHERD,J.P, PEARCE,N.X, SCULLY,C.and LESLIE,I.J.1987a. 'Rates of Violent Crime from Hospital Records'. Lancet Vol. 8575 pp 1460-1471.

SHERMAN, R.C. and DOWDLE, M.D. (1974). 'The Perception of Crime and Punishment: A Multidimensional Scaling Analysis'. Social Science Research Vol.3 pp 109-126.

SHOHAM, S, GUTTMAN, L. and RAHAV, G. (1970). 'A two-Dimensional Space for Classifying Legal Offenses' Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency Vol. 7 pp 219-243.

SHOTLAND,R, HAYWORD,S, YOUNG,C, SIGNORELLA,M, MINDINGAL,L, KENNEDY,J, RORINE,M. and DANOWITZ,E. (1979). 'Fear of Crime in Residential Communities' Criminology Vol. 17 pp 34-57.

SILVERMAN, R.A. and KENNEDY, L.W. (1985). 'Loneliness, Satisfaction and Fear of Crime' Canadian Journal of Criminology Vol. 27 pp 1-13.

SINGER, B.(1973). Feedback and Society Lexington Mass: D.C Heath.

SKOGAN, W.G. (1981). 'Issues in the Measurement of Victimization' Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice.

SKOGAN, W.G (1984). 'Reporting Crimes to the Police: the Status of World Research'. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency Vol. 21 pp 113-137.

SKOGAN, W.G.(1984). The Fear of Crime The Hague: Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice.

SKOGAN, W.G.(1986). 'The fear of Crime and its Behavioural Implications' in A.E Fattah, From Crime Policy to Victim Policy. London: Macmillan pp 167-188.

SKOGAN, W.G.(1987). 'The Impact of Victimisation on Fear' Crime and Delinquency Vol. 33 pp 135-154.

SKOGAN, W.G.(1990). The Police and Public in England and Wales: A British Crime Survey Report. Home Office Research Study No. 117 London: H.M.S.O.

SKOGAN, W.G.(1990). Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighbourhoods. New York: Free Press.

SKOGAN, W. and MAXFIELD, M. (1981). Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighbourhood Reactions. Beverly Hills: Sage.

SMITH, D.(1983). Police and People in London: A Survey of Police Officers. London: Policy Studies Institute.

SMITH, D. and GRAY, J.(1985). Police and People in London Aldershot: Gower.

SMITH, G.(1975). 'Kids, Cops and Conflict: A Participant Observation Study'. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology Vol.2 No.1 pp 21-27.

SMITH, D.M. (1979). Where the Grass is Greener London: Croom Helm.

SMITH, L.J.F.(1983). Criminal Justice Comparisons: The Case of Scotland and England and Wales. Research and planning.

SMITH, S.J. (1982). 'Victimisation in the Inner City: A British Case Study'. British Journal of Criminology Vol.22 No.2 pp 386-402.

SMITH, S.J. (1981). 'Negative Interaction: Crime in the Inner City'. in (ed) Jackson P and Smith S.J Social Interaction and Ethnic Segregation pp 35-37 London: Academic Press.

SOMMER, R. and SOMMER, B. (1980). A Practical Guide to Behavioural Research New York: Oxford University Press.

SPARKS, R.F. (1981). 'Multiple Victimisation, Evidence, Theory and Future Research' Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Vol. 72 pp 762-778.

SPARKS, R, GENN, H. and DODD, D.J. (1977). Surveying Victims: A Study of the Measurement of Criminal Victimisation. Chichesfer, Wiley 1977.

SPENCER, J, (1964). Stress and Release in an Urban Estate London: Tavistock.

STAFFORD, M.C. and GALLE, O.R. (1984). 'Victimisation Rates, Exposure to Risk and Fear of Crime' Criminology Vol. 22 pp 107-185.

STATIN, H, MAGNUSSON, D, and REICHELL, H. (1989), 'Criminal Activity at Different Ages: A Study Based on a Swedish Longitudinal Research Population'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 29 No.4 pp 368-385.

STARK, R, KENT, L, and DOYLE, D.P. (1982). 'Religion and Delinquency: The Ecology of a "Lost" Relationship'. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 19 pp 4-24.

STANKO, E, (1985). Intimate Intrusions London: Routledge

STANKO, E.A. and HOBDELL, K. (1993). 'Assault on Men. Masculinity and Male Victimisation' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 33 No.3 pp.400-415.

STEECH, C.G. (1981). 'Trends in Non-Response Rates 1952-1979' Public Quarterly Vol. 45 pp.40-57.

STINCHCOMBE, A, (1968). Constructing Social Theories New York: Harcourt, Brace Joranovich.

STRUNK, W Jr. and WHITE, E.G. (1972). The Elements of Style 2nd edn. New York: Macmillan.

SUTHERLAND, E.H. (1961). White Collar Crime New York: Holt, Riehart and Winston.

SUTHERLAND, E. and CRESSEY, D. (1970). Criminology 8th edn. New York. Lippincott.

SURRIDGE, B.J. (1930). A Survey of Rural Life in Cyprus Nicosia: Government printing office.

SVERI, K, (1982). 'Comparative analyses of crime by Means of Rictim Surueys: the Scandinavian Experience' in Schneider H (ed). The Victim in International Perspective. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

- SYKES, G.M. and MATZA, D. (1957). 'Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency'. American Sociological Review Vol. 22 pp 664-670.
- TAMBORINI, R, ZILLMANN, D. and BRYANT, J. (1984). 'Fear of Victimization: Exposure to Television and Perceptions of Crime and Fear' in R. Bostrum ed. Communication Yearbook Vol. 8 Beverly Hills. Sage.
- TANNENBAUM, P. and ZILLMAN, D. (1975). 'Emotional Arousal and the Facilitation of Aggression Through Communication' in L. Berkowitz ed. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Vol. 8 New York: Academic.
- TARLING, R. (1982). Unemployment and Crime. London H.M.S.O. Study No. 14:28.
- TAUB, R. P, TAYLOR, D.G. and DUNHAM, J.D. (1984). Paths of Neighbourhood Change: Race and Crime in Urban America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- TAYLOR, B.K., (1970). 'A Report on Three Community Studies in Cyprus'. Report No.4. The Government of Cyprus Department of Welfare Services and Swansea University College Dept. of Social Administration. Cyprus
- TAYLOR, I. (1982). 'On the Sports Violence Question: Soccer Hooliganism Revisited' in J. Hargreaves (ed) Sport Culture and Ideology. London Routledge and Kegan Paul pp 72-90.
- TAYLOR, I, WALTON, P. and YOUNG, J. (1973). The New Criminology London Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- TAYLOR, R. B. and HALE, M. (1986). 'Testing alternative models of Fear of Crime'. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology vol.77 pp 151-189.
- TAYLOR, R.B. and GOTTFREDSON, S.D. (1986). 'Environmental Design, Crime and Prevention: An Examination of Community Dynamics' in A.J Reiss and M. Tonry eds, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research Vol. 8: Communities and Crime: Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- TAYLOR, R.B. and HALE, M. (1986). 'Testing Alternative Models of Fear of Crime'. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology vol. 77 pp 151-189.
- TARLING, R. (1979). Sentencing Prisoners in Magistrates Courts. London H.M.S.O. Study No.56.
- THOMAS, K. (1973). Religion and the Decline of Magic Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- THURNWALD, R. (1968). 'Blood Vengeance Feud' Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences Vol. 8 No. I-II pp 588-589.

TICHENOR, P, DONOHUE, G. and OLIEN, C. (1980). Communicating Conflict and the Press Beverly Hills: Sage.

TIEN, J. M, SIMON, J.W. and LARSON, R.C. (1978). An Alternative Approach to Police Patrols: The Wilmington Split-force Experiment. Cambridge, Mass: Public Systems Evaluation.

TISSEYRE, C. (1976). 'Young People's Perceptions of and Attitude Toward the Police' International Child Welfare Review Vol. 30 No. 31 pp 97-109.

TEERAN, J, and HARTNAGEL, T. (1976). 'The Effect of Television Violence on the Perception of Crime by Adolescents' Sociology and Social Research Vol. 60 pp 337-348.

THRASHER, F. (1928). The Gang: A Study of 1313 Gangs in Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1928.

THURMAN, Q.C. (1984). 'Deviance and the Neutralization of Moral Commitment: An Empirical Analysis'. Deviant Behaviour Vol. 5 pp 291-304.

TRASLER, G. (1962). The Explanation of Criminality London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

TROJANOWICZ, R.C. (1986). 'Evaluating a Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program' in D.P Rosenbaum Community Crime Prevention: Does it work? London: Sage.

VAGG, J. (1992). 'The Borders of Crime- Hong Kong - China Cross - Border Criminal Activity' British Journal of Criminology Vol. 32 No.3 pp 310-328.

VASS, A.A. (1984). Sentenced to Labour: Close Encounters with a Prison Substitute. St Ives: Venus Academica.

Von HENTIG H, (1948). The Criminal and his Victim: Studies in the Sociology of Crime. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press 1948.

VICTOR, J. (1993). Methods of Criminological Research: Contemporary Social Research 19 Series editor Martin Bulmer.

WALKER, N. (1980). Punishment, Danger and Stigma: The Morality of Criminal Justice. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

WALKLATE, S. (1989). Victimology: The Victim and the Criminal Justice System. London: Unwin Hyman 1989.

WALLIS, C.P. and MALLIPHANT, R. (1967). 'Delinquent Areas in the Country of London: Ecological factors'. British Journal of criminology Vol. 7 pp 250-284.

- WARR, M.(1984). 'Fear of Victimization: Why are Women and the Elderly more Afraid'. Social Science Quarterly Vol. 65 pp 681-702.
- WARR, M.(1985). 'Fear of Rape Among Urban Women' Social Problems Vol. 32 pp 238-250.
- WEATHERITT, M. (1986). Innovations in Policing London: Croom Helm/Police Foundation.
- WALSH, D. (1986). 'Victim Selection Procedures among Economic Criminals: The Rational Choice Perspective' in Cornish and Clarke. The Reasoning Criminal. New York, Springer.
- WEST, D.J. (1967). The Young Offender Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- WEST, D.J. (1982). "Delinquency" Its Roots, Career and Prospects London: Heinemann.
- WEST, D.J. and FARRINGTON, D.P. (1973), Who Becomes Delinquent London: Heinemann.
- WEST MIDLANDS POLICE (1983). Review of the Permanent Beat Officer Vol. 1 Report. Birmingham: West Midlands Police.
- WHYTE, W.F. (1943), Street Corner Society. 2nd edn 1955 Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- WILKINS, L. (1964). Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research. London: Tavistock.
- WILKINS, L.T. (1967). Social Policy, Action and Research: Studies in Social Deviance. London: Associated Book Publishers.
- WILLIAMS, J, DUNNING, E. and MURPHY, P.J. (1984). Hooligans Abroad London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- WILLIAMS, J, DUNNING, E, and MURPHY, P.J. (1987). The Social Roots of Football Hooliganism London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- WILLIAMS, P. and DICKINSON, J. (1993). 'Fear of Crime: Read all about it: The Relationship between Newspaper Crime Reporting and Fear of Crime'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 33 No. 1 pp 33-56.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1975). Thinking about Crime New York: Basic Book.
- WILSON, J.Q. and KELLING, G.L. (1982). 'Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety'. Atlantic Vol. 249 No.3 pp 29-38.

WILSON, W.J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WILSON, W.J. (1991). 'Studying Inner-city Dislocations: The Challenge of Public Agenda Research'. American Sociological Review Vol. 56 pp 1-14.

WINKEL, F.W. and VRIJ, A. (1990). 'Fear of Crime and Media Crime Reports: Testing Similarity Hypotheses' International Review of Victimology Vol. 1 pp 251-66.

WOLFGANG, M, FIGLIO, R.M, TRACY, P.E. and SINGER, S.J. (1985). The National Survey of Crime Severity NCJ - 96017 Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

WOLFANG, M. and FARRCUTI, F. (1967). The Subculture of Violence London Tavistock pp 150-163.

WOLF, P. and HAUGE, R, (1975), 'Criminal Violence in Three Scandinavian Countries' Scandinavian Studies in Criminology (Vol. 5) London: Tavistock.

WOOTTON, B. (1959). Social Science and Social Pathology London: Allen and Unwin.

YIN, P. (1980). 'Fear of Crime among the Elderly' Social Problems Vol. 27 pp 492-504.

YIN, P. (1982). 'Fear of Crime as a Problem for the Elderly' Social Problems Vol. 30 pp 240-245.

YOUNG, J. (1971), The Drug Takers London: Paladin.

ZILLMANN, D. (1980). 'Anatomy of Suspense' in P. Tannenbaum" ed The Entertainment Functions of Television Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

ZNANIECKI, F. (1934). The Method of Sociology New Work: Farrar and Rinehart.

Questionnaires

Greek Version

Αρ.

ΕΚΤΙΜΗΣΗ ΕΓΚΛΗΜΑΤΙΚΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΥΠΡΟ

1. Όνομα:.....(προστέτι α')
2. Ηλικία:.....
3. Φύλον:.....
4. Έγγαμ..., Άγαμ..., Χήρ..., Διαζευγμέν...
5. Είδος εργασίας:.....
6. Επίπεδο μόρφωσης:.....
7. Τόπος διαμονής:.....
8. Είδος κατοικίας:.....
9. Εκποισθείς:.....
10. Τοποθεσία συνέντευξης:.....

M. HADJIDEMETRIOU B. A (HON.) M. SC (ECOM.)

θέλω να σου κάνω μερικές
ερωτήσεις που αφορούν την
Αστυνομία.

1. Έχεις φίλον ή γνωστό συγγενικό πρόσωπο που είναι αστυνομικός;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

Γνωρίζεις τουλάχιστο κανένα αστυνομικό που να τον καλείς με το όνομα του (εν υπηρεσία ή όχι);

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

2. Πόσο συχνά βλέπεις αστυνομικό στην γειτονιά σου;

α) Κάθε μέρα
β) Τουλάχιστο μια φορά την εβδομάδα
γ) Το πολύ μια φορά την εβδομάδα
δ) Ποτέ
ε) Δεν απαντώ

3. Πότε ήταν η τελευταία φορά που ήρθες σε επαφή με την αστυνομία;

α) Λιγώτερο από μια εβδομάδα
β) Λιγώτερο από ένα μήνα
γ) Μεταξύ 1-3 μηνών
δ) Μεταξύ 3-6 μηνών
ε) Μεταξύ 6 μηνών και ένα χρόνο
στ) Περισσότερο από ένα χρόνο
ζ) Ποτέ δεν είχα επαφή με την αστυνομία
θ) Δεν απαντώ
Για ποιο λόγο;

4. Ήσουν ευχαριστημένος για την συμπεριφορά της αστυνομίας σ' αυτή την περίπτωση;

α) Ναι - πολύ
β) Ναι
γ) Αδιάφοροι
δ) Όχι
ε) Πολύ απογοητευμένος
στ) Δεν απαντώ

5. Είσαι ικανοποιημένος με την δουλειά που κάνει η αστυνομία στην γειτονιά σου για την εφαρμογή του νόμου;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

Γιατί δεν είσαι ικανοποιημένος;

6. Πώς βλέπεις γενικά την εκτέλεση των καθηκόντων της αστυνομίας;

Πολύ καλή
Καλή
Μέτρια
Φτωχή
Δεν απαντώ

Πώς μπορεί να βελτιωθεί;

7. Εάν καλούσες την αστυνομία σε έκτακτον ανάγκη, νομίζεις ότι θα ανταποκρινόταν αμέσως;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

8. Σε γενικές γραμμές νομίζεις ότι η αστυνομία συμπεριφέρεται δίκαια στον κόσμο;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

Κατά ποιούς τρόπους δεν είναι δίκαιη;

9. Κατά την γνώμη σου υπάρχουν τομείς που η αστυνομία θα έπρεπε να ξοδεύει περισσότερο χρόνο;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

Σε ποιούς τομείς;

Γιατί νομίζεις η αστυνομία δεν
ξοδεύει αρκετό χρόνο σ'αυτούς
τους τομείς;

10. Ένας από τους ρόλους της αστυ-
νομίας είναι να ελέγχει τις
διαδηλώσεις, δημόσιες συγκε-
ντρώσεις, πικετοφορίες, απερ-
γίες και άλλες εκδηλώσεις.
Ήσουν καμιά φορά παρών σε
εκδήλωση που υπήρχε αστυνομία;

Εαν ναι
ήσουν ικανοποιημένος με την
συμπεριφορά της αστυνομίας;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

Εαν όχι
απ'ότι γνωρίζεις, είσαι ικανο-
ποιημένος με την συμπεριφορά
της αστυνομίας σε τέτοιες
εκδηλώσεις;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

11. Νομίζεις ότι η αστυνομία είναι
πάντα αντικειμενική απέναντη
στα διάφορα είδη εκδηλώσεων
π.χ. φοιτητικές, πολιτιστικές,
εργατικές, πολιτικές κ.λ.π,
λαμβανομένου υπ'όψιν του κομ-
ματικού, κοινωνικού, ταξικού
χαρακτήρα των;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ
Τί είδος εκδηλώσεων;

Κατά την γνώμη σου για ποιούς
λόγους;

12. Κατά την γνώμη σου η αστυνομία
συμπεριφέρετε διαφορετικά σε
ωρισμένους ανθρώπους;

Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ
Σε ποιούς;

Σε τί διαφέρει;

Τώρα θέλω να αναφερθώ σε μερικά γεγονότα που μπορεί να συνέβησαν
σε σένα την χρονιά που πέρασε. Θέλω να σκεφτείς προσεκτικά για κάθε
γεγονός και να μου πείς αν σου συνέβηκε τίποτε συγκεκριμένο και αν
ναί τότε και πώς. Παρακαλώ μην βιαστείς και σκέφτου προσεκτικά. Δεν
έχει σημασία αν σ'αυτό το γεγονός ήταν αναμεμυγμένο και άλλο πρό-
σωπο και αν το γεγονός ήταν σοβαρό ή όχι.

Τα γεγονότα είναι τα εξής:

1. Μπήκε κανένας παράνομα στο σπίτι/διαμέρισμα σου τον χρόνο που
περασε;
Πόσες φορές;
2. Δοκίμασε κανένας να μπει παράνομα στο σπίτι/διαμέρισμα σου;
.....
Πόσες φορές;

3. Έχει κλαπεί τίποτε από το σπίτι/διαμέρισμα σου έστω και αν το σπίτι/διαμέρισμα σου δεν έχει διαρρηχθεί ποτέ;
.....
Τί;
4. Μήπως εκρησιμοποίησε κανένας σωματική βία εναντίον σου τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
Τί είδους βία;
5. Μήπως προσπάθησε κανένας να χρησιμοποιήσει σωματική βία εναντίον σας ή να σας παρενοχλήσει τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
.....
Πώς;
Τον/την γνωρίζεις;
6. Μήπως κανένας σε απείλησε ή φοβέρισε να χρησιμοποιήσει βία με οποιονδήποτε τρόπο τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
.....
Μήπως ήταν σε φιλονεικία ή λογομαχία;
7. Έχει κλαπεί τίποτε έξω από το σπίτι/διαμέρισμα σου τον χρόνο που πέρασε; (γκαράζ, αποθήκη, κήπος, βεράντα κ.λ.π).
.....
Τί;
8. Μήπως έχει κλαπεί τίποτε από την τσέπη σας, πορτοφόλι ή τσάντα σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
Τί;
Πού;.....
9. Μήπως προσπάθησε κανένας να κλέψει τίποτε από την τσέπη σας, πορτοφόλι ή τσάντα σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
Τί;
Πού;.....
10. Μήπως έχει κλαπεί τίποτε δικό σας με άλλον τρόπο, κατά τον περασμένο χρόνο, έστω και αν ήταν γνωστός σας ο δράστης;
.....
Τί;
Πού;.....
11. Μήπως προσπάθησε κανένας να κλέψει τίποτε δικό σας με άλλον τρόπο, κατά τον περασμένο χρόνο, έστω και αν ήταν γνωστός σας ο δράστης;
Τί;
Πού;.....
12. Έχεις αυτοκίνητο;
Ναι
Όχι
Δεν απαντώ

- Μήπως έχει κλαπεί το αυτοκίνητο σας ή οδηγήθηκε από άτομο δίχως την συγκατάθεση σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μήπως έχει κλαπεί τίποτε απο το αυτοκίνητο σας (π.χ. ραδιόφωνο, κασσετόφωνο, αντένα κ.λ.π.) τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Τί; Πόσες φορές;...
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μήπως προσπάθησε κανένας να παραβιάσει το αυτοκίνητο σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
13. Μήπως έχεις δίκυκλο (π.χ. ποδήλατο, μοτοποδήλατο, μοτοσυκλέτα κλπ);
 Ναι
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μήπως έχει κλαπεί το δίκυκλο σας ή οδηγήθηκε από άτομο δίχως τη συγκατάθεση σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μήπως έχει κλαπεί τίποτε από το δίκυκλο σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Τί; Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μήπως προσπάθησε κανένας να κλέψει τίποτε από το δίκυκλο σας τον χρόνο που πέρασε;
 Ναι Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
14. Μήπως εκατάστρεψε κανένας δικήν σας περιουσία, εκ προμελέτης, κατά τον περασμένο χρόνο (π.χ. μέσα ή έξω από το σπίτι σας);
 Ναι Τί; Πόσες φορές;
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
15. Μήπως τον περασμένο χρόνο σας συνέβηκε τίποτε που θα μπορούσε να θεωρηθεί σαν έγκλημα οιασδήποτε μορφής (κάτι εναντίον του νόμου);
 Ναι
 Όχι
 Δεν απαντώ
- Μπορείς να περιγράψεις με λίγα λόγια τι συνέβηκε;
-
-
-

Μήπως κάλεσες την αστυνομία για τα πιο πάνω αδικήματα;

Ναι
Οχι
Δεν απαντώ

Γιατί δεν κάλεσες την αστυνομία;

Ενόμισα ότι τα αδικήματα δεν ήταν σοβαρά

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα ανταποκρινόταν

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα έκανε τίποτε

Ενόμισα ότι ήταν προσωπικό θέμα

Δεν ήθελα να αναμιχθώ

Φόβος εκδίκησης από τον δράστη

Γιατί η αστυνομία ήταν ήδη επιτόπου

Γιατί κάποιος άλλος κάλεσε την αστυνομία

Συνδυασμός των πιο πάνω

Άλλος λόγος

Δεν απαντώ

16. Μήπως τον περασμένο χρόνο είδες τίποτε που θα μπορούσε να θεωρηθεί σαν έγκλημα οιασδήποτε μορφής (κάτι εναντίον του νόμου);

Ναι
Οχι
Δεν απαντώ

Μπορείς να περιγράψεις με λίγα λόγια τι συνέβηκε;

Μήπως κάλεσες την αστυνομία για τα πιο πάνω αδικήματα;

Ναι
Οχι
Δεν απαντώ

Γιατί δεν κάλεσες την αστυνομία;

Ενόμισα ότι τα αδικήματα δεν ήταν σοβαρά

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα ανταποκρινόταν

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα έκανε τίποτε

Ενόμισα ότι ήταν προσωπικό θέμα

Δεν ήθελα να αναμιχθώ

Φόβος εκδίκησης από τον δράστη

Γιατί η αστυνομία ήταν ήδη επιτόπου

Γιατί κάποιος άλλος κάλεσε την αστυνομία

Συνδυασμός των πιο πάνω

Άλλος λόγος

Δεν απαντώ

17. Μήπως ένα ή περισσότερα από τα αδικήματα που ανέφερα πιο πάνω συνέβηκαν σε μέλος της οικογένειάς σου (π.χ σύζυγο, παιδί, γονείς, στενός συγγενής) τον χρόνο που πέρασε;

Ναι
Οχι
Δεν απαντώ

Μπορείς να περιγράψεις με λίγα λόγια τι συνέβηκε;

Μήπως κάλεσες την αστυνομία για τα πιο πάνω αδικήματα;

Ναι

Όχι

Δεν απαντώ

Γιατί δεν κάλεσες την αστυνομία;

Ενόμισα ότι τα αδικήματα δεν ήταν σοβαρά

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα ανταποκρινόταν

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα έκανε τίποτε

Ενόμισα ότι ήταν προσωπικό θέμα

Δεν ήθελα να αναμιχθώ

Φόβος εκδίκησης από τον δράστη

Γιατί η αστυνομία ήταν ήδη επιτόπου

Γιατί κάποιος άλλος κάλεσε την αστυνομία

Συνδυασμός των πιο πάνω

Άλλος λόγος

Δεν απαντώ

18. Μήπως ένα ή περισσότερα από τα αδικήματα που ανέφερα πιο πάνω συνέβηκαν σε μέλος της οικογένειάς σου (π.χ σύζυγο, παιδί, γονείς, στενός συγγενής) όχι μόνο κατά τον χρόνο που πέρασε αλλά και προηγουμένως;

Ναι

Όχι

Δεν απαντώ

Μπορείς να περιγράψεις με λίγα λόγια τι συνέβηκε;

Μήπως κάλεσες την αστυνομία για τα πιο πάνω αδικήματα;

Ναι

Όχι

Δεν απαντώ

Γιατί δεν κάλεσες την αστυνομία;

Ενόμισα ότι τα αδικήματα δεν ήταν σοβαρά

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα ανταποκρινόταν

Ενόμισα ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα έκανε τίποτε

Ενόμισα ότι ήταν προσωπικό θέμα

Δεν ήθελα να αναμιχθώ

Φόβος εκδίκησης από τον δράστη

Γιατί η αστυνομία ήταν ήδη επιτόπου

Γιατί κάποιος άλλος κάλεσε την αστυνομία

Συνδυασμός των πιο πάνω

Άλλος λόγος

Δεν απαντώ

19. Κατά τη γνώμη σου η Εγκληματικότητα
στη Κύπρο αυξήθηκε κατά τα τελευταία
χρόνια;

Ναι

Όχι

Δεν απαντώ

Εαν ναι, μπορείς να μου πεις που
οφείλεται αυτό;

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

20. Ποιά αδικήματα κατά τη γνώμη μου
αυξήθηκαν;

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

21. Πως μπορεί το κράτος να καταπολεμήσει
αυτή την κατάσταση;

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

English Version

Cyprus Crime Survey

- 1.Name:.....
- 2. Age:
- 3.Sex:.....
- 4. Marital Status:.....
- 5. Employment:.....
- 6. Education Level:.....
- 7. Army Record:.....
- 8. Place of Residence:
- 9. Type of Accommodation:.....
- 10. Displaced:.....

(Ask All)

Now I would like to ask you a question about the police.

1. Do you have a close friend or relative who is a policeman?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. NK

(If No)

Do you know a policeman well enough to call him by name if you meet him, (either on or off duty)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. NK

(ASK ALL)

2. How often do you see a policeman in this neighbourhood?

- 1. Every day
- 2. At least once a week
- 3. Less than once a week
- 4. Never
- x. NK

3. When was the last time you had any contact with the police?

- 1. Less than 1 month ago
- 2. 1 month or more, less than 3
- 3. 3 months or more, less than 6
- 4. 6 months or more, less than 1 year
- 5. A year or more ago
- 6. Never had any contact
- X. NK

What were the circumstances? (WRITE IN VERBATIM, IF CRIME VICTIMIZATION, DO NOT PROBE)

4. Were you satisfied with what the police did on the occasion?

- 1. Yes - very
- 2. Yes
- 3. Indifferent
- 4. No
- 5. Very dissatisfied
- x. NK

(ASK ALL)

5. Are you satisfied with the job that the police are doing in this neighbourhood?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- x. NK

(If No)

In what way are you dissatisfied? (WRITE IN VERBATIM)

(ASK ALL)

6. What sort of job do you think the police do in general? Do you think it is: -

- 1. Very good
- 2. Good
- 3 Fair
- 4. Poor
- X. NK

(If Not Good)

In what ways could they do better? (WRITE IN VERBATIM)

(ASK ALL)

7. If you called the police in an emergency, do you think that they would respond immediately?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

8. Do you think in general the police are fair in dealing with people?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(If No)

In what ways are they unfair? (WRITE IN VERBATIM)

9. Are there any things which you think the police should be spending more time on?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(If No)

What sorts of things? (WRITE IN VERBATIM)

Why do you think the police are not spending enough time on these things?
(WRITE IN VERBATIM)

(ASK ALL)

10. One thing the police do is try and control demonstrations, public meetings, picketing and the like. Have you ever been present at a demonstration where the police were present?

(If Yes)

Did you approve of the way in which the police behaved?

- Yes
- No
- NK

(If No)

11. From what you know, do you approve of the way the police generally behave at demonstrations, etc?

- Yes
- No
- NK

12. Do you think that the police ever behave differently towards different kinds of demonstrators, for example, students. Trade Unionists, immigrants?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(If Yes)

Which kinds of people and in what ways do the police behave differently?
(WRITE IN VERBATIM)

(THEN CONTINUE)

Now I want to ask you about some things which may have happened to you in that period. I want you to think carefully about each one, and tell me if anything of that kind did happen to you in the past year, and if so how many times it happened. Please take your time and think carefully, and if you remember something which happened to you which might fit the description I give, let me know, it doesn't matter who else was involved, or whether you think it was serious or not.

Here are the things I would like to know about:

1. Did anyone break into your house/flat in the past year?
(PROBE: Did anyone get into your house/flat without your permission?)
2. Did anyone try to break into your house/flat, or try to get in without your permission?
(PROBE: Did you find the lock or catch on a door or window tampered with?)
3. Was anything stolen from inside your house/flat, even though the house/flat itself wasn't broken into?
(PROBE: Did anyone just walk in and take something?)
4. Did anyone physically attack you or assault you, in any way, during the past year?
(PROBE: Did anyone hit you, or use any other kind of violence against you?)
5. Did anyone try to attack you, or assault you, or molest you in any way?
(PROBE: Anyone-even someone you knew? For example, in an argument or quarrel?)
6. In the past year, did anyone threaten you in any way with violence of any kind?
(PROBE: Anyone-even someone you knew? Were you in any situation in which violence might have been used against you - for example, an argument or a quarrel?)
7. Was anything taken from outside you house/flat in the past year? For example from the garage or doorstep? (PROBE: A bicycle, dustbin, clothes off the washing line?)
8. Did you have anything stolen from your pocket or briefcase/bag during the past year?
(PROBE: For example, when you were out shopping/at work-even if you got it back later?)

9. Did anyone try to take anything belonging to you in those circumstances?
10. Did anyone steal anything lese from you, at any other time or place during the past year?
(PROBE: Did anyone take anything belonging to you which they had no right to take? Even someone you knew?)
11. Did anyone try to steal anything else from you, at any time in the past year, or try to take anything else which they had no right to?
(PROBE: When you were out in the evening? IF HAD HOLIDAY: When you were on holiday?)
12. Do you own a car?
1. Yes
2. No
X. NK

(If Yes)

Was your car stolen during the past year?
(PROBE: Did anyone take your car and use it without your permission - even if you got it back later?)

Was anything stolen from your car? (PROBE: For example, any property which you had left in the car, or parts of the car itself).

Did you find your car tampered with in any way for example, did anyone apparently try to get into it or start it, without your permission?

(ASK ALL)

13. Do you own a motorbike or motor scooter?
1. Yes
2. No
X. NK

(If Yes)

Was your motorbike/scooter stolen during the past year?
(PROBE: Did anyone take your motorbike/scooter without your permission - even if you got it back later?)

Was anything stolen from your motorbike/ scooter?
(PROBE: Any parts of the motorbike/scooter itself?)

(ASK ALL)

14. Did anyone deliberately damage any property belonging to you during the past year?
(PROBE: For example, a window in you house/flat, or anything you had left outside the house/flat?)

(ASK ALL)

15. In the past year, did anything else happen to you which you think might have involved a crime of any kind?
(PROBE: Anything which was against the law?)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(IF YES)

Can you tell me briefly what happened?

Did you inform the police about (MENTION INCIDENT)?

YES
NO
NK

(IF NO)

Why didn't you inform the police?

- 1. Didn't think crime serious enough
- 2. Didn't think the police would come
- 3. Didn't think police could do any good
- 4. Thought it was a private matter
- 5. Didn't want to get involved
- 6. Fear of retaliation
- 7. Police already on the scene
- 8. Somebody else called the police
- 9. Combination of the above
- 10. Other
- 11. NK

(ASK ALL)

16. Did you see any (other) incident in the past year which you think might have involved a crime?
(PROBE: For example, a fight or an assault: Or someone taking something that did not belong to him, or deliberately damaging property?)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(IF YES)

Can you tell me briefly what it was?

Did you inform the police about (MENTION INCIDENT)?

Yes
No
NK

(IF NO)

Why didn't you inform the police?

- 1. Didn't think crime serious enough
- 2. Didn't think the police would come
- 3. Didn't think police could do any good
- 4. Thought it was a private matter
- 5. Didn't want to get involved
- 6. Fear of retaliation
- 7. Police already on the scene
- 8. Somebody else called the police
- 9. Combination of the above
- 10. Other
- 11. NK

17. Did any of the things I have mentioned happen to anyone else in your household in the past year? (MENTION THEM INDIVIDUALLY, E.C. Your wife, your son, your lodger?)
(PROBE: Did anyone have anything stolen from them? Was anyone attacked or assaulted? Was anybody threatened with violence?)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(IF YES)

Just briefly what happened?

Did you inform the police about (MENTION INCIDENT)?

- Yes
- No
- NK

(IF NO)

Why didn't you inform the police?

- 1. Didn't think crime serious enough
- 2. Didn't think the police would come
- 3. Didn't think police could do any good
- 4. Thought it was a private matter
- 5. Didn't want to get involved
- 6. Fear of retaliation
- 7. Police already on the scene
- 8. Somebody else called the police
- 9. Combination of the above
- 10. Other
- 11. NK

(ASK ALL)

18. Have any of the things I mentioned ever happened to you, or to any member of your family, not just in the past year, but at any time?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- X. NK

(IF YES)

Just briefly tell me what happened?

Did you inform the police about (MENTION INCIDENT)?

YES

NO

NK

(IF NO)

Why didn't you inform the police?

- 1. Didn't think crime serious enough**
- 2. Didn't think the police would come**
- 3. Didn't think police could do any good**
- 4. Thought it was a private matter**
- 5. Didn't want to get involved**
- 6. Fear of retaliation**
- 7. Police already on the scene**
- 8. Somebody else called the police**
- 9. Combination of the above**
- 10. Other**
- 11. NK**

19. Has criminality increased within the last year.

YES

NO

NK

If Yes

Can you give me the reasons why?

20. Which offences have increased.

21. How can the state combat this situation.

Detail analysis of Responses per question

Table 1: Summary totals of the respondents who have a relative or acquainted with a policeman.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|-------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|----|---|---|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 4 | 4 | | 13 | 4 | | 2 | | | 21 | 10 | 2 | 1 | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | | | 1 | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 4 | 4 | | 18 | 4 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 22 | 13 | 2 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | 2 | | | | 2 | | 12 | 3 | | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 13 | 7 | 2 | 1 | | 4 | | 30 | 6 | 1 | 3 | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 4 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 2 | | | | | 6 | | 8 | 1 | 4 | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 1 | 4 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 10 | 2 | 18 | 3 | 10 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 16 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | 6 | 1 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 10 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 18 | 8 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 1 | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 10 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 13 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 8 | 2 | | | | | | | 16 | 7 | 4 | 3 | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 18 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 29 | 9 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | 4 | | 2 | 3 | | | | 16 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | 5 | 4 | | 1 | | | | | 8 | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 11 | 8 | | 3 | 3 | | | | 24 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| TOTAL N | | | 44 | 28 | | 44 | 18 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 87 | 26 | 107 | 35 | 21 | 9 | 1 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 23 | 14 | | 24 | 7 | | 5 | 1 | 41 | 15 | 53 | 23 | 14 | 3 | 1 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 21 | 14 | | 20 | 11 | 2 | 2 | | 46 | 11 | 54 | 12 | 7 | 6 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 4 | 4 | | 31 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 52 | 19 | 3 | 4 | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 1 | 10 | | 6 | 3 | | 3 | | 28 | 10 | 32 | 7 | 13 | 2 | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 29 | 14 | | 7 | 4 | | 1 | | 53 | 12 | 23 | 9 | 5 | 3 | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 27 | 18 | | 32 | 15 | 2 | 7 | | 51 | 8 | 78 | 25 | 17 | 8 | 1 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 17 | 10 | | 12 | 3 | | 1 | | 36 | 18 | 29 | 10 | 4 | 1 | |

Table 2: Summary of the respondents who know a policeman by name.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|-------------|----|----|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 4 | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | 9 | | | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | 1 | | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 4 | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 4 | | | 1 | 11 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| | | RURAL | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | 1 |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 5 | | | | | 3 |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 4 | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | 4 | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | 4 | | | | | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 6 | | | | 1 | | | | 8 | | | 4 | | | | | | 1 |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 4 | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | | | | | 7 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 6 | | | | 1 | | | | 9 | | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 4 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 8 | | | 2 | 1 | | | | 3 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| TOTAL N | | 28 | | | 3 | 12 | 3 | | 1 | 26 | | 8 | 26 | 1 | | 2 | 7 | | | |
| TOTAL MALES | | 14 | | | 1 | 6 | | | 1 | 15 | | 7 | 15 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | 14 | | | 2 | 6 | 3 | | | 11 | | 1 | 11 | | | 1 | 5 | | | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | 4 | | | 1 | 7 | 3 | | 1 | 4 | | 2 | 16 | 1 | | | 4 | | | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | 10 | | | | 3 | | | | 10 | | 2 | 5 | | | | 2 | | | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | 14 | | | 2 | 2 | | | | 12 | | 4 | 5 | | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | 18 | | | 3 | 9 | 3 | | | 8 | | 6 | 19 | | | | 2 | 6 | | |
| TOTAL RURAL | | 10 | | | | 3 | | | 1 | 18 | | 2 | 7 | 1 | | | | 1 | | |

Table 3: Summary table of the frequency of witnessing a policeman in the neighbourhood.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|---|---|-----------|---|----|----|---|------------|----|---|----|---|-------------|---|----|----|---|-----------|----|----|----|---|------------|---|---|----|---|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | | ELEMENTARY | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 5 | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 | 1 | 7 | 11 | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 5 | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 6 | | 2 | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | 14 | 2 | 7 | 12 | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | 8 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | 5 | 2 | | | | | | 2 | | | 7 | 2 | 5 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | | 5 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | | | 4 | | | 15 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 2 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 5 | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 2 | 4 | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 2 | | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 6 | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 6 | | 5 | | 2 | 4 | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 8 | | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 6 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | | 10 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 3 | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | 16 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 8 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | | 26 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 1 | 7 | | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | 7 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | 3 | 5 | 1 | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 6 | 2 | 9 | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | 10 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL IN | | | 29 | 12 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 18 | 6 | 23 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 56 | 8 | 28 | 17 | 4 | 35 | 20 | 26 | 38 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 2 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 7 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 38 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 27 | 15 | 12 | 21 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 14 | 4 | 19 | 4 | | 10 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | 18 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 2 | 28 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 5 | 2 | | | 1 | 11 | 2 | 17 | 12 | 2 | 3 | | | 1 | | 6 | | 4 | | | 29 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 10 | 2 | 7 | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 14 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 6 | | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 14 | 8 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 5 | | 4 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 36 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 20 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 3 | 17 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 29 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 3 | 36 | 10 | 20 | 34 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 2 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 9 | 4 | 12 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | | | | | 1 | | 27 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 4 | | | | 2 | 3 | |

Table 4: Summary table of the last time since contacting the police.

| | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----|------------|------------|---|---|----|----|----|-----------|-----|---|----|----|-------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|----|----|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | ELEMENTARY | | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | | | ELEMENTARY | | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | | |
| | | | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | | | | |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VII | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VIII | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IX | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL X | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL XI | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL XII | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL XIII | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL XIV | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | M | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 26 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL XV | 4 | 7 | 6 | 23 | | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | | 2 | 2</ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5: Summary table of the level of satisfaction out of contact with the police.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----|-----------|----------------|---|---|-------|---|---|---------------|---|---|-------|----|----|----------------|----|----|-------|----|----|----------------|----|----|-------|----|----|---------------|----|----|-------|----|----|----------------|----|----|-------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | --ELEMENTARY-- | | | | | | --SECONDARY-- | | | | | | --UNIVERSITY-- | | | | | | --ELEMENTARY-- | | | | | | --SECONDARY-- | | | | | | --UNIVERSITY-- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | a b c | | | d e f | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 6: Summary table of the level of satisfaction of police performance when policing neighbourhoods.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|-------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 4 | 4 | | 9 | 5 | 3 | 2 | | | 17 | 12 | 2 |
| | | RURAL | | | | 3 | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 4 | 4 | | 12 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 21 | 12 | 2 |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 12 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 15 | 5 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | 2 | | | 2 | | 14 | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 17 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 29 | 6 | 1 |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 6 | | 6 | 3 | |
| | | TOTAL III | 3 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 12 | 17 | 4 | |
| | F | URBAN | 8 | 2 | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 3 |
| | | RURAL | 6 | | | | | | | 8 | | 1 | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 14 | 2 | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 24 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 3 |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 14 | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 10 | | | | | | | 21 | 2 | 7 | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 24 | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 34 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | 10 | | | 5 | | | | 18 | | 7 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | 7 | 2 | | | 1 | | | 9 | | 3 | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 17 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | | | 27 | | 10 | 2 | |
| TOTAL N | | | 62 | 10 | | 43 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 104 | 7 | 2 | |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 31 | 6 | | 17 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 51 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 31 | 4 | | 26 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 53 | 2 | 2 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 4 | 4 | | 29 | 10 | 5 | 4 | | 7 | 1 | 2 | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 17 | 4 | | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 36 | 2 | | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 41 | 2 | | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 61 | 4 | | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 37 | 8 | | 34 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 53 | 4 | 2 | |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 25 | 2 | | 9 | 6 | | 1 | | 51 | 3 | | |

Table 7: Summary table of the level of police performance in general.

| | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|------------|----|----|---|---|-----------|----|----|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | ELEMENTARY | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | | ELEMENTARY | | | | | SECONDARY | | | | | UNIVERSITY | | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | a | b | c | d | e | | | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 2 | 6 | | | | 1 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | | | 1 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 3 | 2 | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | 4 | | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 2 | 10 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 2 | 10 | 2 | | | 3 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 7 | 15 | 2 | | | 3 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | 10 | | | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | RURAL | 4 | 5 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 4 | 15 | | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL N | | 13 | 45 | 14 | | | 7 | 32 | 18 | 3 | 4 | | 6 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL MALES | | 7 | 20 | 10 | | | 3 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 1 | | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | 6 | 25 | 4 | | | 4 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | 2 | 6 | | | | 2 | 22 | 14 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | 2 | 13 | 6 | | | 4 | 3 | 2 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | 11 | 30 | 2 | | | 1 | 7 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | 2 | 29 | 14 | | | 5 | 25 | 15 | 2 | 2 | | 6 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL RURAL | | 11 | 16 | | | | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 8: Summary table of the readiness of the police to respond to an emergency.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|-------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 4 | 4 | | 10 | 6 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | 18 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 4 | 4 | | 13 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 3 | | 21 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 8 | 7 | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 14 | 5 | 2 | | 3 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 4 | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 12 | 10 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | 24 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 5 | 1 | | 11 | | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | 6 | | | 7 | 2 | | 4 | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 11 | 1 | | 18 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 4 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 18 | | | 12 | 3 | 2 | 4 | | |
| | | RURAL | 6 | | | | | | | | | 6 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 10 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 24 | 2 | | 13 | 3 | 2 | 4 | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 10 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 15 | | | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 10 | | | | | | | | | 23 | | | 7 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 20 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 38 | | | 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | 7 | 3 | | 3 | 2 | | | | | 16 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | | 5 | | |
| | | RURAL | 8 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 15 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | | | | 21 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 1 | | 5 | | |
| TOTAL DN | | | 52 | 5 | 15 | 38 | 22 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 99 | 8 | 6 | 104 | 30 | 8 | 23 | 6 | 2 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 27 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 1 | | 52 | 4 | | 56 | 17 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 2 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 25 | 3 | 7 | 19 | 13 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 47 | 4 | 6 | 48 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 3 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 4 | | 4 | 25 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 45 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 5 | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 13 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | | | 35 | 3 | | 31 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 35 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 59 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 3 | 1 | 8 | | 1 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 26 | 5 | 14 | 30 | 16 | 3 | 6 | | 1 | 54 | 2 | 3 | 73 | 23 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 2 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 26 | | 1 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | | 45 | 6 | 3 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 5 | | |

Table 9: Summary table of a perception of justfull behaviour by the police.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|-------------|----|----|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 8 | | | 13 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 18 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 5 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 8 | | | 17 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | | | 5 | 1 | | 21 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 10 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | | 13 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 4 | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 8 | 7 | | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 14 | 7 | 1 | | 1 | | 4 | | | 21 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 1 | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 3 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 6 | | | 10 | 2 | | 6 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 6 | | | 8 | 1 | | 4 | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 5 | | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | 12 | | | 18 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 10 | | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 12 | 6 | | 11 | 5 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| | | RURAL | 6 | | | | | | | | 8 | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 16 | | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 20 | 6 | | 11 | 6 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 15 | | | 11 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 9 | 1 | | | | | | | 21 | | 2 | 6 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 19 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 36 | | 2 | 17 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | | |
| | F | URBAN | 8 | 2 | | 5 | | | | | 12 | 2 | 4 | 9 | | | 5 | | | |
| | | RURAL | 8 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 7 | 2 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 16 | 2 | 1 | 6 | | | | | 19 | 4 | 4 | 12 | | | 5 | | | |
| TOTAL N | | | 64 | 5 | 3 | 48 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 96 | 11 | 6 | 100 | 34 | 8 | 27 | 3 | 1 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 32 | 3 | 2 | 24 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 56 | 16 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 32 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 8 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 43 | 10 | 4 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 12 | 1 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 8 | | | 31 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 1 | | 42 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 2 | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 21 | | | 7 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 32 | 6 | | 29 | 7 | 3 | 14 | 1 | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 35 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 1 | | 1 | | | 55 | 4 | 6 | 29 | 3 | | 8 | | 1 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 39 | 4 | 2 | 38 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 47 | 8 | 4 | 72 | 23 | 8 | 22 | 3 | 1 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 25 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | 49 | 3 | 2 | 28 | 11 | | 5 | | |

Table 10: Summary table of whether police should spend more time on certain aspects.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|-------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | | | | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | | | | | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 8 | | | 13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 20 | 6 | 5 | 3 | | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | | | 6 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 8 | | | 17 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 23 | | | | | | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 12 | 3 | | 1 | | | 2 | | 13 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | 11 | 4 | | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 17 | 5 | | 1 | | | 4 | | 24 | 9 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 3 | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 4 | | 7 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 6 | | | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 5 | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 8 | 4 | | 12 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 9 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 13 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 6 | | | | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 15 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 16 | 7 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 9 | 5 | | 5 | | | 1 | | | 7 | 8 | | 8 | 5 | | 4 | | |
| | | RURAL | 7 | 3 | | | | | | | | 14 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 16 | 8 | | 5 | | | 1 | | | 21 | 13 | 4 | 11 | 9 | | 4 | | |
| | F | URBAN | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | | | | | 12 | 6 | | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 2 | 7 | | 3 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 3 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 2 | | | | | 14 | 13 | | 6 | 5 | 1 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL EN | | | 47 | 16 | 9 | 48 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 1 | | 63 | 43 | 7 | 90 | 38 | 14 | 29 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 29 | 8 | | 23 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | | 29 | 23 | 4 | 46 | 21 | 9 | 17 | | 1 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 18 | 8 | 9 | 25 | 8 | | 2 | | | 34 | 20 | 3 | 44 | 17 | 5 | 12 | 1 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 8 | | | 34 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 4 | 6 | | 47 | 16 | 8 | 7 | | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 20 | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | | | 24 | 11 | 3 | 26 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 19 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 2 | | 1 | | | 35 | 26 | 4 | 17 | 14 | 1 | 9 | | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 30 | 8 | 7 | 37 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 1 | | 36 | 21 | 2 | 67 | 24 | 12 | 24 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 17 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 27 | 22 | 5 | 23 | 14 | 2 | 5 | | |

Table 11: Summary table of the number of respondents being present in demonstrations, etc.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|-------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 8 | | | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 15 | 8 | 6 | 3 | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 3 | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 8 | | | 11 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | 17 | 9 | 7 | 3 | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | 2 | | | 10 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | 19 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 6 | | | 10 | 1 | | 4 | 3 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 6 | | | 8 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL III | 3 | 2 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 12 | | | 18 | 2 | | 7 | 4 | |
| | F | URBAN | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 11 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 11 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 4 | 11 | | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 5 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | 7 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 12 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 11 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | | 4 | 3 | | 2 | | | | 5 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | | 4 | 3 | | | 1 | | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 6 | 4 | 7 | 3 | | 3 | | | 9 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| TOTAL N | | | 31 | 13 | 17 | 32 | 11 | 13 | 5 | 2 | | 45 | 45 | 10 | 82 | 31 | 17 | 19 | 7 | 3 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 23 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | | 23 | 22 | 1 | 45 | 17 | 10 | 12 | 5 | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 8 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 6 | 2 | | | 22 | 23 | 9 | 37 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 8 | | | 21 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 4 | | 36 | 16 | 11 | 5 | | 2 |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 23 | 9 | 4 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 5 | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 18 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | 20 | 32 | 6 | 19 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 24 | 3 | 10 | 27 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 2 | | 28 | 25 | 5 | 56 | 24 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | | | | 17 | 20 | 5 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Table 11a: Summary table of public satisfaction of police behaviour when taking part in demonstrations, etc.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|-------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | | | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 4 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | | | | 3 | | | 1 | 4 | | 1 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 1 | | | | | | 4 | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 4 | | | | | | 5 | 1 | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL III | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 6 | | | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 1 | | | | | | 6 | | | 1 | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 3 | | | | | | 6 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | F | URBAN | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| TOTAL IN | | | 11 | | | 8 | | | 1 | 13 | | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 3 | | | 4 | | | 1 | 10 | | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 8 | | | 4 | | | | 3 | | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | | | | 7 | | | 1 | 4 | | 6 | 2 | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 6 | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 5 | | | | | | | 7 | | 2 | | 2 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 8 | | | 4 | | | | 1 | | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 3 | | | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | |

Table 12: Summary table of the police objectivity when policing political, social and cultural events.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|-------------|----|-----------|-----|------------|----|----|----|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | ELEMENTARY | | SECONDARY | | UNIVERSITY | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 6 | 2 | | 12 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 14 | 14 | 3 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 2 | 3 | | 1 | | 6 | | 3 | 1 | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 6 | 2 | | 14 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | | 17 | 14 | 4 | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 9 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | 8 | 6 | 7 | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | 2 | | | | 2 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 14 | 5 | 3 | | 1 | 4 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 1 | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 2 | 11 | | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | | |
| | | TOTAL III | 3 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 8 | 4 | 18 | 2 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 9 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 3 |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 11 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 4 |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 13 | | 2 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| | | RURAL | 5 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | 16 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| | | TOTAL V | 11 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | 29 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| | F | URBAN | 4 | | 6 | 2 | | 3 | | | 13 | | 5 | 7 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | 5 | | 4 | 1 | | | | | 5 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 9 | | 10 | 3 | | 3 | | | 18 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| TOTAL IN | | | 40 | 10 | 22 | 38 | 14 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 74 | 13 | 26 | 79 | 41 | 22 |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 20 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 43 | 7 | 6 | 47 | 22 | 7 |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 20 | 1 | 14 | 20 | 6 | 7 | | 2 | 31 | 6 | 20 | 32 | 19 | 15 |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 6 | | 2 | 28 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 6 | | 4 | 35 | 24 | 12 |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 14 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 21 | 9 | 8 | 25 | 9 | 5 |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 20 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 47 | 4 | 14 | 19 | 8 | 5 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 26 | 7 | 12 | 30 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 40 | 6 | 13 | 54 | 34 | 15 |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 14 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 34 | 7 | 13 | 25 | 7 | 7 |

Table 13: Summary table of whether police behaves differently to specific people.

| | | | REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | NON-REFUGEE | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|-------------|----|----|-----------|----|----|------------|----|----|--|
| | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | ELEMENTARY | | | SECONDARY | | | UNIVERSITY | | | |
| AGE GROUP | SEX | RESIDENCY | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | YES | NO | DN | |
| 15-29 | M | URBAN | 8 | | | 11 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | 26 | 5 | | 3 | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 5 | | | | | 1 | | 2 | 4 | | 2 | 2 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL I | 8 | | | 16 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | | 2 | 4 | | 28 | 7 | | 3 | | |
| | F | URBAN | | | | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | 12 | 5 | 4 | 3 | | | |
| | | RURAL | | | | 4 | 3 | | | | | 2 | | | 12 | 3 | | | 1 | | |
| | | TOTAL II | | | | 15 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | | | 24 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | |
| 30-44 | M | URBAN | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 7 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | | 4 | 2 | | 6 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL III | 5 | | | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | | 13 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | |
| | F | URBAN | 4 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 10 | 8 | | 15 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | |
| | | RURAL | 2 | | 4 | | | | | | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL IV | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | | | 14 | 10 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 45-60 | M | URBAN | 12 | 2 | | 5 | | | | 1 | 10 | 5 | | 8 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | RURAL | 10 | | | | | | | | | 12 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL V | 22 | 2 | | 5 | | | | 1 | | 22 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 8 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | F | URBAN | 6 | 4 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | 11 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 3 | | 4 | 1 | | |
| | | RURAL | 4 | 5 | | 1 | | | | | | 7 | 2 | | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| | | TOTAL VI | 10 | 9 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | 18 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | |
| TOTAL EN | | | 51 | 17 | 4 | 47 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 66 | 41 | 6 | 100 | 34 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 5 | |
| TOTAL MALES | | | 35 | 2 | | 24 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 24 | 2 | 53 | 22 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | |
| TOTAL FEMALES | | | 16 | 15 | 4 | 23 | 8 | 2 | 2 | | | 36 | 17 | 4 | 47 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 1 | |
| TOTAL 15-29 | | | 8 | | | 31 | 8 | 5 | 3 | | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 52 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 1 | | |
| TOTAL 30-44 | | | 11 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 16 | 2 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | |
| TOTAL 45-60 | | | 32 | 11 | | 9 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 40 | 21 | 4 | 19 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 33 | 12 | | 35 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 35 | 22 | 2 | 74 | 23 | 6 | 19 | 3 | 4 | |
| TOTAL RURAL | | | 18 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 3 | | | | 1 | 31 | 19 | 4 | 26 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | |

Forms of victimisation per starting point

Table 1a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the town of
Nicosia.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | Mat, souvenir, watch, wallet. |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Quarrel 3. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Petrol, flouers, cloths. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | Business. |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | Petrols, clothes, handbags. |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Spot light 3, basket. |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car, letter box, car cover. |

Table 2a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Acropolis.

| VICTIMIZATION | | FREQUENCIES: (a.items reported stolen, (b.causes of victimization, (c.items reported damaged. |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | |
| 3. Burglary | Bicycle. | |
| 4. Use of violence | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | |
| 6. Threatening | | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Flowers, clothes, paints. | |
| 8. Theft from the person | Jewelery, hat. | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | Handbag. | |
| 10. Theft in general | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | Tape-recorder. | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Rear-mirror, spot light 4, petrol. | |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car 3. | |

Table 3a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Engoni.

| FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen, (b. causes of victimization, (c. items reported damaged. | |
|--|----------------|
| VICTIMIZATION | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Bicycle, pots. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | Petrol. |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Bicycle. |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car 2. |

Table 4a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Ay. Omoloyites.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Motorbike, tools. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | Petrol. |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | Motor-bike. |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car. |

Table 5a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Dassoupolis.

| FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen, (b. causes of victimization, (c. items reported damaged. | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| VICTIMIZATION | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | Quarrel. |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Argument. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | |
| 8. Theft from the person | Money 14. |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | Various items. |
| 11. Attempt in general | Money, stationery. |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | Spot lights 2, rear-mirror. |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Spot light. |
| 14. Criminal damage | Vending machine. |

Table 6a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Ay. Pavlos.

FREQUENCIES: {a. items reported stolen,
{b. causes of victimization,
{c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Argument 2. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Flower pots 4. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | Jewelery 2. |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 7a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Kaiaakli.

FREQUENCIES: {a.items reported stolen,
{b.causes of victimization,
{c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Argument. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | |
| 8. Theft from the person | Money. |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | Vo. |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Various items. |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car. |

Table 8a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Fallouriotissa.

FREQUENCIES: {a.items reported stolen,
{b.causes of victimization,
{c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

| | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Quarrel 2. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | |
| 8. Theft from the person | Money. |
| 9. Attempt from the person | Money 2. |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | Money. |
| 12a.Theft of a car | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | Car tyre. |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Car cover. |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 9a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Anthoupolis.

FREQUENCIES: {a. items reported stolen,
{b. causes of victimization,
{c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
outside the house
8. Theft from the person
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items
from car
- 12c. Attempt of parts or
items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Various items.

Bicycles 2.

Table 10a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Makedonitissa.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Garden chairs 2, flower pots 2, motor-bike. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | Brief case. |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Sun glasses-airials 2. |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 11a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Strovolos.

| FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen, (b. causes of victimization, (c. items reported damaged. | |
|--|---------------------|
| VICTIMIZATION | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Flower pots, tools. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | Fruit. |
| 11. Attempt in general | Copy right. |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Spot light 1, |
| 14. Criminal damage | Car 2. |

Table 12a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Aglantzia.

FREQUENCIES: {a.items reported stolen,
{b.causes of victimization,
{c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
outside the house
8. Theft from the person Money 2.
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a.Theft of a car
- 12b.Theft of parts or items
from car
- 12c.Attempt of parts or
items from car
- 13a.Theft of motor-bike
- 13b.Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Table 13a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the suburb of Ay. Domestios.

| FREQUENCIES: (a.items reported stolen, (b.causes of victimization, (c.items reported damaged. | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| VICTIMIZATION | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | Money, flower pots. |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | Argument. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Tools 3, bicycle, flower pots. |
| 8. Theft from the person | Money 2, tools. |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | Cassettes 2, souvenir. |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | Bicycle. |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Rear-mirror. |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 14a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the village of Paleomatcho.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | Bicycle 2. |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | |
| 6. Threatening | |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | Flower pots 2. |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | Watch. |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 15a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the village of Kokkinotrimithia.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
outside the house Garden chairs, flower pots, tools.
8. Theft from the person
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items
from car Aerial.
- 12c. Attempt of parts or
items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Table 16a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the village of Dali.

FREQUENCIES: {a.items reported stolen,
{b.causes of victimization,
{c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
 2. Attempt an Entry
 3. Burglary
 4. Use of violence
 5. Attempt of violence
 6. Threatening
 7. Theft of property from
outside the house
 8. Theft from the person
 9. Attempt from the person
 10. Theft in general
 11. Attempt in general
 - 12a.Theft of a car
 - 12b.Theft of parts or items
from car
 - 12c.Attempt of parts or
items from car
 - 13a.Theft of motor-bike
 - 13b.Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike
 14. Criminal damage
- Cassettes.

Table 17a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the village of Latsia.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
outside the house
8. Theft from the person
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items
from car
- 12c. Attempt of parts or
items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Arquament 2.

Flower pots, garden chairs, various items.

Spot lights 2, airial.

Table 18a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the village of Lakatamia.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
(b. causes of victimization,
(c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence Football match.
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
 outside the house Floers 3.
8. Theft from the person
9. Atteapt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items
 from car
- 12c. Attempt of parts or
 items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
 from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Table 19a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the
R.H.E. Latsia.

FREQUENCIES: (a. items reported stolen,
 (b. causes of victimization,
 (c. items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
 outside the house
8. Theft from the person
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a. Theft of a car
- 12b. Theft of parts or items
 from car
- 12c. Attempt of parts or
 items from car
- 13a. Theft of motor-bike
- 13b. Theft of parts & items
 from motor-bike
14. Criminal damage

Tools 3, flower pots 3, garden tools.

Car cover.

Table 20a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the
R.H.E. Strovolos 2.

FREQUENCIES: (a.items reported stolen,
 (b.causes of victimization,
 (c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1. Breaking an Entry | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | |
| 3. Burglary | |
| 4. Use of violence | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | Unexpected quarrel. |
| 6. Threatening | Argument. |
| 7. Theft of property from outside the house | |
| 8. Theft from the person | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | |
| 10. Theft in general | |
| 11. Attempt in general | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | Petrol 2, watch. |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | Petrol. |
| 14. Criminal damage | |

Table 21a: Forms of victimization as it was reported by victims from the district of Nicosia.

FREQUENCIES: {a.items reported stolen,
{b.causes of victimization,
{c.items reported damaged.

VICTIMIZATION

1. Breaking an Entry
2. Attempt an Entry
3. Burglary
4. Use of violence
5. Attempt of violence
6. Threatening
7. Theft of property from
outside the house
8. Theft from the person Money.
9. Attempt from the person
10. Theft in general
11. Attempt in general
- 12a.Theft of a car
- 12b.Theft of parts or itees
from car
- 12c.Attempt of parts or
items from car
- 13a.Theft of motor-bike
- 13b.Theft of parts & items
from motor-bike Car battery.
14. Criminal damage

Number of victimisation cases reported
per starting point

Table 1: Cases reported from the town of Nicosia.

| VICTIMIZATION | TOTAL SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-----------|----|----|-----------|-----|-----------|------|------------|-------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | |
| 3. Burglary | 4 | 4 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 10. Theft in general | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or iteas from car | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or iteas from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & iteas from motor-bike | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 3 | | 4 | 4 | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | |
| TOTAL | 36 | 16 | 20 | 26 | 10 | 15 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 15 | 3 | |

Table 2: Cases reported from the suburb of Acropolis.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT.ST. MAR. SIN. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE-GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | | Urb | Rur | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 3. Burglary | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 4. Use of violence | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 5 | 1 | 6 | | | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 14. Criminal damage | 3 | | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | |
| TOTAL | 18 | 4 | 22 | | | 7 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 14 | 4 | 4 |

Table 3: Cases reported from the suburb of Engomi.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|---|-----|---|-----------|---|-------------------|------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or itens from car | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or itens from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & itens from motor-bike | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 14. Criminal damage | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| TOTAL | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Table 4: Cases reported from the suburb of Ay. Omologites.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 14: Criminal damage | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| TOTAL | 3 | 2 | | 5 | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | | | 5 | |

Table 5: Cases reported from the suburb of Dassoupolis.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|----|-----------|----|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 6. Threatening | 3 | 1 | | 4 | | | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | | 3 | | 1 |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | 3 |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 11. Attempt in general | 2 | | 2 | | | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | | 3 | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| TOTAL | 7 | 13 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 12 | 8 | 20 | | 8 | 7 | 5 |

Table 6: Cases reported from the suburb of Ay. Pavlos.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|----|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 2 | 2 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | | | 2 | 2 |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or iteas from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 10 | 12 | | | 4 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 12 | | | 10 | 2 |

Table 7: Cases reported from the suburb of Kalaakli.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or iteas from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or iteas from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & iteas from motor-bike | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 14. Criminal damage | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| TOTAL | 3 | 1 | | 4 | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | | | | 4 | |

Table 8: Cases reported from the suburb of Pallouriotissa.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 8 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 10 | | 4 | 2 | 4 | |

Table 9: Cases reported from the township of Anthoupolis.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|--|
| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 10: Cases reported from the suburb of Makedonitissa.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT.ST. MAR. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|-----------|---|-------------------|-------------------|---|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | NON | | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 7. Theft of property | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| outside the house | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from car | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from motor-bike | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 7 |

Table 11: Cases reported from the suburb of Strovolos.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|---|-----------|----|-------------------|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | 1 | | 1 | 1 | - 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| outside the house | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 11. Attempt in general | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| from motor-bike | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | | 6 | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | |
| TOTAL | 14 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 3 |

Table 12: Cases reported from the suburb of Aglantzia.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | ST. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or iteas from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 |

Table 13: Cases reported from the suburb of Ay. Dometios.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|----|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|--|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| 3. Burglary | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| 4. Use of violence | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 6. Threatening | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 22 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 12 | 13 | 25 | | 15 | 6 | 4 | |

Table 14: Cases reported from the village of Paleometoho.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | 2 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | 5 | 2 | 3 | | | 5 | 1 | 4 |

Table 15: Cases reported from the village of Kokkinotrimithia.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| | SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.ST. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | | | | | | |
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 3 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 2 | 2 | 1 |

Table 16: Cases reported from the village of Dali.

| | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | | 1 |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Table 17: Cases reported from the village of Latsia.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------|-----|----------------|------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|---|---|
| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | | |
| M | F | E | S-U | | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | | |
| 1. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 2. | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | | |
| 7. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| 9. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| 12c. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 2 |

Table 18: Cases reported from the village of Lakatamia.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|---|-----|---|-----------|---|-----------|------|------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | | 2 | | 3 | 1 | | 2 |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a. Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b. Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c. Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a. Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b. Theft of parts & itees from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 5 | 3 | | 2 |

Table 19: Cases reported from the R.H.E. Latsia.

| VICTIMIZATION | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED REF. | MARIT. ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | |
|--|-----|---|-----------|---|---|----------------|------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|
| | M | F | E | S | U | | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 5 | 5 | | | | 1 | | 4 |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| 12c.Atttempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

Table 20: Cases reported from the R.H.E. Strovolos 2.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|----|---|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|--|
| SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| 4. Use of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| 5. Attempt of violence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Theft from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 2 | | 13 | | 13 | | 13 | | 13 | | 13 | | | |

Table 21: Cases reported from the district of Nicosia.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | MARIT.ST. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 |
| 1. Breaking an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Attempt an Entry | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Burglary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 6. Threatening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Theft of property outside the house | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 9. Attempt from the person | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Theft in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Attempt in general | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12a.Theft of a car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12b.Theft of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12c.Attempt of parts or items from car | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13a.Theft of motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13b.Theft of parts & items from motor-bike | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 14. Criminal damage | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Detail figures of dark crime per
starting point

Table 1: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Strovolos including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUP'S | | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-------------|------|-----------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|-----------|---|--------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NOR | MAR. | SIRL. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 7 | 2 | 4 | 5 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 9 | | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 | |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).
16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).
17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).
18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 2: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Ay. Domestios including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------------------|------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | F/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 3: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Engoni including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARRI.STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|---|-----------|------|-------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NOR | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 5: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Fallouriotissa including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|---|--------------|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | P/CE REF. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | | 1 | | 4 | | 5 | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Table 6: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Ay. Omologites including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| | | SEX | | EDUCATION | | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|-----|-------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-------|-----------|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l | | |
| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 2 | | 6 | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 | | 5 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | |
| 16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | .3 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 7: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Kaimakli including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | FEF. NOH | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).
- 16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).
- 17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).
- 18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Table 8: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Dassoupolis including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|---|--------------|-----|-----------|------|-------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUP'S | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NOW | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l | |
| 1 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 9: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the R.H.E. Strovolos including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | F/CE REF. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
| M F | E S U | REF. NON | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 10: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Acropolis including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT.STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUP'S | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|---|-----------|------|-------------|------|-----------|-----|-------------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 4 | 3 | | | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).
- 16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).
- 17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).
- 18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 11: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the town on Nicosia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the Police.

| SEX | | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | P/CE REF. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|---|-----------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-----|------------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/A | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 6 | 4 | | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 3 | | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).
16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).
17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).
18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 12: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Makedonitissa including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NON | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 13: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the suburb of Fallouriotissa including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | F/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NON | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 14: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the district of Nicosia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|---|--------------|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|-------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | | P/CE REF. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 15: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the R.H.E. Latsia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the Police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REF. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NOW | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 16: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the township of Anthoupolis including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| -SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NON | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

16.Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18.Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

Table 17: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the village of Latsia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|---|--------------|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------------------------|---|---|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | | DISPLACED | | MARIT. STAT. | | RESIDENCY | | AGE GROUPS | | P/CE REP. | | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NOU | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K. | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 18: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the village of Dali including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| VICTIMIZATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------------------|------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT. STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | F | E | S | U | REF. | NON | MAR. | SIN. | Urb | Rur | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-60 | Y | N | D/K | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 19: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the village of Pokkinotriathia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | MARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NOY | MAR. SIN. | Urb Rur | 13-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Table 20: Cases of crime reported to us by subjects from the village of Lakatamia including proportions and reasons of not reporting cases to the police.

| SEX | EDUCATION | DISPLACED | PARIT.STAT. | RESIDENCY | AGE GROUPS | P/CE REP. | REASONS OF NOT REPORTING |
|-----|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| M F | E S U | REF. NON | MAR. SIN. Urb | Rur | 15-29 30-44 45-60 | Y N D/K | a b c d e f g h i j k l |

VICTIMIZATION

15. Did anything happen to you which can be considered as crime (last year).

3 2 1 3 2 1 3 1 2 3 3

16. Did you see anything that can be considered as crime (last year).

1 1 1 1 1 1 1

17. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (last year).

18. Has any member of your family fallen victim of a crime (irrelevant of year).